DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 090 CG 011 103

AUTHOR Haffa, Robert P., Jr., Ed.
TITLE Women and the American Economy: A Bicentennial Appraisal. Proceedings of the Air Force Academy Assembly (18th, Colorado Springs, Colorado, March 10-13, 1976).
INSTITUTION Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 82p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; Disadvantaged Groups; *Females; *Feminism; *Labor Force; Life Style; *Sex Discrimination; *Social Factors; Socioeconomic Influences; Working Women

ABSTRACT

The proceedings delve into facets of the women's movement in America and, particularly the effect of women on the national economy. Highlighted are the speeches to the Assembly of Ms. Betty Friedan, Mrs. Catherine East, Dr. Peggy Kruger, Dr. Jean Lipman-Blumen, and Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly, as well as a final report adopted by the Assembly. The personal, social, and economic factors which have altered the awareness of traditional sex roles and have given impetus to the "sex role revolution" are enumerated and discussed. The impact of the changing sex stereotype upon the family and society is detailed. Pros and cons of the Equal Rights Amendment are presented. (HMCL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED136090

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

EIGHTEENTH AIR FORCE ACADEMY ASSEMBLY

WOMEN AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

A BICENTENNIAL APPRAISAL

PROCEEDINGS

2

CG 011 103

Copies of the Final Reports/Proceedings of all US Air Force Academy Assemblies may be purchased from:

US Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Virginia 22151

Specific price information may be found in the appropriate NTIS publication "Government Reports Announcements." Please use the following AD number when ordering a specific Proceedings.

ASSEMBLY TITLE		NTIS AD NO.
1st	"International Stability and Progress"	AD 783643
2nd	"The Representation of the US Abroad"	AD 783644
3rd	"National Goals: Challenges for the Sixties"	AD 783655
4th	"Arms Control"	AD 777920
5th	"The Secretary of State"	AD 777941
6th	"Outer Space"	AD 777942
7th	"The Congress and the American Future"	AD 777923
8th	"Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations"	AD 777924
9th	"A World of Nuclear Powers?"	AD 777925
10th	"The United States and Eastern Europe"	AD 777922
11th	"Overcoming World Hunger"	AD 777932
12th	"The States and the Urban Crisis"	AD 711652
13th	"The United States and the Caribbean"	AD 777943
14th	"The United States and Japan"	AD 777944
15th	"The United States and the United Nations"	AD 777921
16th	"Choosing the President"	ADA 001636
17th	"Multinational Corporations"	ADA 017292
18th	"Women and the American Economy"	Not Yet Assgnd

PROCEEDINGS

OF

The Eighteenth Air Force Academy Assembly

WOMEN AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY:
A Bicentennial Appraisal

March 10-13, 1976

The Eighteenth Air Force Academy Assembly is cosponsored by the American Assembly, Columbia University, New York and the United States Air Force Academy.

THE EIGHTEENTH AIR FORCE ACADEMY ASSEMBLY

United States Air Force Academy

LIEUTENANT GENERAL JAMES R. ALLEN
Superintendent

BRIGADIER GENERAL STANLEY C. BECK
Commandant of Cadets

BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM T. WOODYARD
Dean of the Faculty

The American Assembly

MR. CLIFFORD C. NELSON
President

OBJECTIVES

To provide an outstanding group of college students with an opportunity to study and discuss major national and international issues.

To provide these students with a realization of the difficulties of analyzing and reaching consensus on such issues.

To develop in them an appreciation for a national community of values through contact with contemporaries drawn from widely representative institutions.

PREFACE

On March 10, 1976, 90 students from 61 colleges around the nation met at the United States Air Force Academy for the Eighteenth Air Force Academy Assembly. During the Assembly, these delegates participated in round-table sessions to discuss the Assembly topic, "Women and the American Economy". On the fourth day, a final report containing their findings and conclusions was reviewed and approved.

During the Assembly, the participants heard a keynote address by Ms. Betty Friedan, and witnessed a special film and lecture by Dr. Antonia Brico. In addition, a panel discussed the Assembly topic, and responded to delegates' questions. Participating in the panel were Mrs. Catherine East, currently serving as Deputy Coordinator of the Secretariat for International Women's Year, Dr. Peggy Kruger, Equal Opportunity Officer at the University of Texas, Dr. Jean Lipman-Blumen, Director of the Women's Research Program for the National Institute of Education, and Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly, Chairman, "Stop ERA." Also in attendance were six senior participants from business, academic and governmental backgrounds who served as moderators of the round-tables, as well as observers from various professional military schools and academies. The texts of the Assembly addresses as well as the delegates' Final Report are presented in this pamphlet.

The United States Air Force Academy Assembly is cosponsored by the United States Air Force Academy and the American Assembly, Columbia University. Neither institution takes a partisan position on any subject explored during the Assembly. The Assembly is sponsored as a public service to provide a setting and a technique for bringing a group of outstanding undergraduate students together. It affords them the opportunity of studying and discussing a vital national issue, and then inserts their opinions into the flow of American thought.

The background papers used by the delegates in preparing for the Assembly were provided by the American Assembly and have been published in book form. This volume, *Women and the American Economy*, is available from the publisher, Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632.

CONTENTS

Welcome 5
Lieutenant General James R. Allen
Mr. David Mortimer

Keynote Address 10
Ms. Betty Friedan

Special Film and Lecture 30
Dr. Antonia Brico

Panel Discussion 32
Mrs. Catherine East
Dr. Peggy Kruger
Dr. Jean Lipman-Blumen
Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly

Round-table Agenda 53

Round-table Participants 56

Final Report 62

Colleges and Universities Represented 69

Cadet and Officer Staffs 70

History of the US Air Force Academy Assembly . . . 72

GENERAL WELCOME

REMARKS BY THE SUPERINTENDENT

Lieutenant General James R. Allen

Superintendent

United States Air Force Academy

Lieutenant General James R. Allen

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to welcome you to the Eighteenth Air Force Academy Assembly. Our purpose is to provide you with a stimulating environment for formulating and expressing new ideas. The American Assembly of Columbia University, the cosponsor of this conference, has encouraged the growth of informed opinion since its founding in 1950. The Assembly provides an opportunity to exchange ideas and enter into dialogue with outstanding scholars and practitioners concerning the major issues of our national policy. It is not the intention of the American Assembly or the Air Force Academy to foster any particular position on the issues that will be raised here, but rather to provide an effective forum for discussion and delegate interaction. Your final report will be a consensus report, and it will be yours; we hope that it will be useful and informative to all who have interest in the topic.

This year the Academy Assembly is once again pleased to present a topic of national importance and current interest, "Women and the American Economy: A Bicentennial Appraisal". As you know, the Air Force Academy will admit women for the first time in just three months. We are planning on producing an outstanding group of women officers in the Class of 1980, and will read your final report with special interest.

We are honored and delighted that you have chosen to visit us. Your cadet hosts are eager to insure that your stay will be pleasant, productive and interesting. Please feel free to call upon them for any information or assistance that you might require. I am sure that when you look back upon the Assembly, you will find it to have been an exciting and valuable experience.

WELCOME

Mr. David Mortimer

Secretary

The American Assembly

Columbia University

Mr. Mortimer

My part at this opening session is to describe briefly The American Assembly organization and the program.

The American Assembly was founded in 1950 by Dwight D. Eisenhower, when he was president of Columbia University. His central idea was that citizens of this country are perfectly capable of making decisions on public policy questions if they have access to adequate information. In order for this to happen, a greater flow of information was needed and a method by which individuals could express their views and have them registered. He saw the necessity for interaction of ideas among people of varying views. Finally, a technique was needed for reaching conclusions that would attract the broadest consensus. The American Assembly and its conference technique was organized and designed to meet these needs. Since its founding it has, we think, fulfilled Ike's expectations and provided an informal and non-partisan setting for the nation's citizens to discuss major public questions and search out wise answers.

The first American Assembly was held in 1951 at Arden House in New York State. Since then, new programs have been initiated regularly at least twice a year. The participants have consistently been leaders in their respective spheres. The topics they discuss are selected for their timeliness and relevance to public interest. With the success of the national Assembly, it was decided to expand the program by seeking other educational institutions to sponsor similar Assemblies for their part of the country. In this way more than 130 educational institutions inside and outside the United States have joined with The American Assembly. Several of these have held as many as six or seven Assemblies on and off over the years. But not the Air Force Academy. We haven't missed in eighteen years and in that number is implicit all our admiration for the officers and cadets whose tremendous effort has made this exercise possible. This Assembly is unique not only because it is composed entirely of students, but also because it draws its participants from throughout the nation, and therefore we call it our 2nd National Assembly.

To explain how the program operates, The American Assembly contracts an editor, in this case Juanita Kreps, to supervise the preparation of background chapters, and these are sent to the participants in advance of the Arden House Assembly. While at Arden House, where all our programs originate, the participants engage in in-depth discussion of an agenda for four days and on the final day in plenary session adopt a final report of recommendation. This particular final report received a circulation of 100,000 copies. On this topic, aside from the Arden House meeting, a regional assembly has already taken place for the Gulf States with Tulane University. This Fall two more regionals are scheduled–one in Florida for the Southeast and the other in the far West.

I would like to emphasize that this Assembly is autonomous–this is, The American Assembly itself has no stake in its outcome. What we offer is a reasonably reliable body of background literature and a conference technique. I can only stress–what comes out is up to you. Your report will be printed and circulated by the Air Force Academy and our experience indicates that it will be widely read. We do not claim that a meeting such as this one or an Assembly report by itself results in a particular policy or course of action. But we do feel it creates the kind of climate that is necessary for such to take place.

We wish you well.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

March 10, 1976

OPENING REMARKS BY MS. BETTY FRIEDAN

Ms Betty Friedan

13

Ms. Friedan

I'm glad to be here to talk about certain issues that are very germane in this Bicentennial Year, 1976, on "Women and the Economy." And, of course, I speak not as an economist, but as one of the agitators, leaders, or founders of the women's movement. This great unfinished second American revolution, the movement of women to full equality, human freedom, human dignity, full identity; her own identity in society, in the family of man. This revolution is economic in its causes and in its basic implications, though it goes beyond those economic implications, and is preeminently in its values, and, in a way that I think we are only beginning to realize, an American revolution.

I say that the womens' movement *is* economic and, that in your dealings here these next few days on the implications of questions of women in the economy, you *must* take into account the womens' movement both in terms of why it happened, this modern womens' movement, the one that erupted in the early 60s, 50 dormant years after the winning of the vote; the economic reasons for it, and its basic economic implications because, I think if you don't sense the unique and irreversible nature of this juncture in history you could go wrong in your deliberations.

The women's movement did not erupt in the mid-60's because I or any other witch of Salem, somehow seduced otherwise happy housewives who were having orgasms waxing the kitchen floor. The womens' movement historically had to happen; it was a necessary way-station if you will, in the evolution of society.

In a certain sense several generations of American women were simultaneously faced with a massive crises of identity which could no longer be ignored. The identity of women in society had been defined by her biological child-bearing anatomy, "anatomy is destiny," Freud wrote, and it *was* for women, for generations, for centuries indeed. They were limited by child-bearing; they lived not many years beyond child-bearing; they could die in child-bearing and they did not have the control of the child-bearing process either technologically or for other reasons. When in earlier periods

of history many children had to be born for a few to survive, as is still the case in the less developed nations of the world, and when the only security of old age was the number of sons (that hasn't been true for a long time in our nation) and when the work of the society, the tilling of the earth, the fighting of the wars, required enormous numbers of bodies, women were defined primarily as breeders. They also shared the work of society and, in primative stages of economic development, although they may not have been equal because they were always subservient to their roles as breeders, they did carry a share in the work society, in agrarian economies, in simple stages of economy where there are single family farms, where peasants toil in the field, where the food is prepared at home, the cloth is woven at home, where, even in the earlier days, of this country, men and women went west with the wagon trains, and shared in the work and, then, in the earlier days of the cities there were the single family, the "mom and pop" stores, etc. The advent of the industrial revolution changed all that and, in fact, for a good number of years in this country, it has no longer been possible for a woman to live out her life according to the conventional role that has still defined her.

In 1963 when my book *The Feminine Mystique* first came out, it was part of a catalytic agent for this womens' movement, this revolution, because it burst through the blinders in our consciousness and it put into words what women had been feeling subconsciously anyway, a long delayed, very necessary change in consciousness for women to realize they had no choice but to confront their identity as people in society.

In a 75 year life span, which is my life's expectancy standing here; and for the young women in this audience, there may be a hundred years of active human life, it is not possible any longer for women to spend most of her hours, much less her years, as a child bearer or child rearer; furthermore, she now has control of her child-bearing process, the technological control due to birth control devices, and the legal control, as a result of the women's movement and the Supreme Court decision on birth control and abortion.

Third, the work of society has moved beyond those simplicities and moved beyond the stage where it depended on the brute muscular force where women could not be equal to men, increasing to the stage where it required human capacities of intelligence where girl children and boy children are potentially equal and human sensitivities cannot be replaced by a machine, and where women, in fact, have been socialized to excel.

Finally, the work of society, the work of this current society and its decision making have moved beyond the simplicities of that single family farm, or shop, or ranch, into the larger complexities of industry, of profession, of cities. And for women to have a voice in the decisions and a part of the action and a self respecting share of the work, they *must* face the demands required by the work of society. Not a *value* statement—a *factual* statement.

Now the steak is bought at the supermarket, it is no longer the cow grazing on the grass of the ranch, and it costs so much money that it requires a two income family and increasingly, in the changing form of the family, women are supporting themselves and children; their work outside the home is necessary for the support of the whole family.

For these reasons, which are basically economic, in the last 10 years there has been first a great change of consciousness with regard to women. And the first stage of a modern revolution is a basic change in consciousness so that women broke through that feminine mystique which defined them solely in terms of their sexual relation to man – as wife, child-bearer, mother, a server of physical needs of husband and home and children – not in primary human terms; and began to define herself finally as a human being by her own actions in society. When we did that, and *only* when we did that, could we look around and see that the whole society was structured so that all the fields of profession outside the home were structured as man's world and women moved in that only as freaks or exceptions, the invisible person in the office, or she did the housework. In effect the domestic servant, the cleaning person, or the anonymous clerk as she did the housework at home. And the home was structured completely as woman's world, and somehow between those

two, women were locked in.

The cause was economic, but the impetus was the basic values of American democracy, because when women looked around them and began to define themselves as people in society they were merely taking the basic values of American democracy – equality of opportunity, self-determination, "no taxation without representation," the value of the individual, the value of independence, freedom, human dignity – and applying them to their own situation in the office, the factory, and the school. According to those values, a woman could see that she was somehow oppressed, she was denied her basic American and human birthright. That is what we did, in effect, when we started the womens' movement.

In 1966 I wrote the Statement of Purpose of NOW (which was the first and still is the largest and the only organization with a national structure in the modern womens' movement), and its basic goal was to take action to bring women into participation into the mainstream of American society. Full equality for women and fully equal partnership with men, and to break through the barriers of every institution in every profession that kept women from a voice in decision making, from equal responsibility, opportunity, reward, and her own voice.

Now in 10 years there were breakthroughs, in every institution, in every profession. The impetus following in part, and taking certain lessons from the Black Civil Rights movement, but then women moving very fast, and finally uniquely on their own, because, while certain analogies were valid between the women and the blacks, there were certain ideological mistakes when people tried to define the ideology of the womens' movement in terms of either race warfare or class warfare. The relationship of woman to man is *not* the same as race, of black to white, it is *not* the same as class, worker to boss, and only when you see this revolution in its own unique terms can you understand what it is. This is a revolution of, in effect, the majority of the population. A good half, slightly more than half of the population, which has not been moving equally in society, a movement to equality in society, in a two-sex society, where to deny the

sexual, human, emotional, biological, interdependence of woman and man and their human needs for each other, is to misunderstand the dynamics of this whole thing.

The economic part in the society, where the breakthroughs remain, seemed relatively clearcut at first. There were the major breakthroughs against explicit sex discrimination.

First the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which had seemed to be passed by a fluke, a southern Congressman, Howard Smith of Virginia, added sex discrimination on at the last minute to try to delay the passage of the Civil Rights Act for the blacks. And everybody laughed, and Congress practically had to be adjourned because of laughter, and the first commissioners of the Equal Opportunity Commission joked at press conferences. When someone asked, "What do you intend to do, commissioner, about sex discrimination?" and the commissioner said, "Ha, Ha, I guess we'll have to let men be Playboy bunnies," but the womens' movement was organized because women knew that this was a serious matter, sex discrimination. We might never have a chance again like this law, and we needed a movement just like the blacks had to get it enforced and we got it enforced; perhaps, not as well as it should have been, but it is now the case and I think it is generally considered in America that sex discrimination is *wrong*, it is also *illegal*, and the telephone company has had to pay nearly 70 million by now in reparations, back wages, to women that had never been allowed to apply for jobs beyond operator before. And the stewardesses no longer have to resign at ages 30 or 35 or marriage as they used to, they can age gracefully on the planes like the pilots. They can even have babies and go back to work. And when I fly on an airplane these days, because I'm connected with the womens' movement, the stewardesses ply me with free champagne because they have become very militant. They are objecting to the kind of advertising that says, "I'm Barbara, fly me", and somehow treats the stewardesses as something less than selfrespecting operators of airplanes on whose lives the passengers depend.

The professional schools, the law schools, the medical schools, no longer have 1, 2, or 3 percent of women, but maybe a third of the class is women, and the quotas against women

in professional schools and universities are now outlawed by Title IX, another gain in the women's movement. Furthermore, we gained an executive order; we demanded it, and got it, (as an organization of the women's movement showed obvious political power), that any institution or company with a government contract suspected of being guilty of sex or race discrimination had to take affirmative action to end it, or could lose the government contract. Again, the enforcement has been a sufficient deterrent to cause institutions to examine and at least, to make the beginning breakthrough attempts against practices that discriminate against women. Women are moving in, and they are moving up.

The fact is that your institution, the Air Force Academy, is preparing to admit its first women in advance of the Equal Rights Amendment that would force you to do it. Well, I think it's good that you are in advance of the Equal Rights Amendment, but we only have four states to go, so that it's probably just as well that you are getting ready, and you will be "all cooled up," as it were, when the ERA is passed.

The churches where the women used to make the church suppers and were insulted in the sermons. . . . Now women are being ordained as ministers and rabbis. The Episcopal women had to take the law of God in their own hands with some help from the their elder brothers to be ordained to the priesthood, but they did it and the Roman Catholic nuns are not going to be far behind; there is a very militant rebellion of the nuns in the Catholic church.

In the political parties, as you know, the women are no longer content to make coffee, not policy, and three times as many are running as before. The polls show that the great majority of American women now know that they are going to have to work outside the home most of the years of their lives and they expect equality in their treatment; their aspirations are different than they used to be, they believe that sex discrimination is wrong. Further, the majority of men also support improving the status of women in society.

All this has happened in a very short period of time. And it has happened primarily because it's been a values revolution from which no one could be quite immune. When women

crossed the line of generation, and class and race and began to move and demand, to move as people in their own right in society, then what they do and what happens affects everyone. There's no way that the children of women or the men that come home to women at night; the sons, husbands, and fathers of women cannot be affected equally. This revolution cannot be isolated and segregated very easily. This revolution affects the way we all live. I believe that the pseudo-radical rhetoric that tried to make analogies of class and race warfare, and apply them to sex, got us off on a wrong tangent, yet, on the other hand, it became increasingly clear over those 10 years – that what was involved here was *not* just a few women gettings jobs only men had held before, sitting in university seats that only men had held before but what was ultimately going to be involved was the restructure of *all* of our institutions. The institutions of work and institutions of family, and home. Equality is what it's all about and equality for women with men, equality of women in society, has enormous implications for every institution. Inevitably, this has to mean basic changes in the society. But not the changes that are envisaged when we think glibly in terms of revolutions of the past, or overthrow of the system, or overthrow even of the groups in power.

I want to get into that just a little bit because the rhetoric has been misleading. When in the late 60s and early 70s the women's movement really exploded; when from its first beginning, the change in consciousness, and then the organization of the movement, and then great numbers of the young women who had been cutting their political eye teeth in the student movement of the 60s applying the doctrines of class warfare to the subject of race. When *these* women began to come into the women's movement, with relatively little experience in life, they tried to apply too literally class warfare and race warfare doctrines to their situations as women; and, I think, they obscured the economic basis of this revolution.

The ideology of sex/class warfare which said, in effect, that women, as a class, are oppressed by men, the class, the oppressor. The name of the game, therefore, is for women to rise up and overthrow and take the power away from men; and, somehow man is the enemy, then the family is the enemy, childbearing is the enemy, motherhood is the enemy,

even sex itself – anything to have to do with man, – is the enemy. And a whole new kind of "mystique", if you will, was built up around that, and it seemed plausible to angry women. And women had reason to be angry, women had a lot of reason to be angry, because they were put down at the office and in the home. For generations women had been taking it out on their own bodies and they had been taking it out in self-hate and they had been taking it out inadvertently on their children and on their husbands. Now it was out in the open and they could believe that man was the enemy, either the individual man, husband, lover, boss, or man as a class. But it was, and is, more complex than that; and many of us are now beginning to realize that we see now that the women's movement for equality was simply the necessary first stage of a sex *role* revolution, not of woman against man, but of woman and man necessarily having to liberate themselves from the obsolete, unequal, polarized masculine and feminine sex roles that we have been locked into, that have locked us in mutual torment in the family; and, have created pathological conditions in society and unnecessary problems for us all.

The sex role revolution, the women's movement for equality, was the first stage of women moving from a definition of themselves as passive feminine dependents, defined solely in society in relation to husband and children, into their necessity of moving in society on their own terms and then, if they are Americans, they are going to demand to move as Americans with equality and all the values thereof.

Well, what's the other part of it? There's a book called *Masculine and Feminine* that I would paraphrase, to give you the feeling of what I mean by sex role revolution. He is playing masculine, she is playing feminine. He is playing the big powerful brutal He-man, that the helpless little ninny that she is playing, is supposed to admire. She is playing the sweet helpless little flower, that the big powerful brutal He-man that he is playing is supposed to desire. He desires her for the softness, the gentleness, the tenderness, the sensitivity that he is not allowed to develop or experience or express in himself. She admires him for the strength, and the courage, and the guts and the independence and the freedom that she is not

allowed to develop or express in herself. If he were not playing masculine, he might be more feminine than she, in one or more of those soft and tender, and gentle qualities that have been defined as feminine in our society. So he has to play harder and harder masculine until he becomes brutal and dangerous in his domineering manner, in his *machismo*. If she were not playing feminine, she might be more masculine than he in one or more of those strong, hard, independent, adventurous qualities that have been defined as masculine in our society. So she has to play softer and softer, more passive and feminine until she becomes contemptible in her ineffectiveness and full of self-contempt. And then, he begins to hate her for the lack of the tender, soft, qualities in his own experience, and she to resent, envy, hate him for the lack of the freedom and the adventure and the strength and confidence in her own experience. And they take their revenge on each other in bed, and out. So far not good, but even-handed. But the hitch was that the name of the game that he was playing, the masculine game, was the power game in society; that was where the action was. She had to move, as I said earlier, for economic reasons for reasons of economic and technological evolution, she *had* to move first; for this women's movement for equality between sexes, the women's movement for equality. Also, she could say right out that she wanted her share of those values that society acknowledges, in a way that the man could not, for those despised feminine values.

But in the last 10 years, the sex role revolution has also been going on among men. When I was here at this Air Force Academy 3 years ago, a big rebellion had just taken place over the length of the hair, and I don't know how that was finally resolved, but it was quite an issue when I was here. And I might say that the young men wearing their hair long in the past decade in many universities, if not in the Air Force Academy, and the elders that were hating them or emulating them or clubbing them down for repressed envy; they were, somehow, saying "no" to the stereotyped masculine sex role. They were saying, "I don't have to be crew cut, tight lipped, and brutal to be a man. I don't have to be dominant, over anyone and everyone, to prove that I'm a

man. I don't have to be superior to everyone in the world, I don't have to napalm all the children in Vietnam and Cambodia and the green leaves off the trees to prove that I'm a man." No, and they were saying, "I can be tender, gentle, compassionate, I can admit sometimes that I'm afraid. I can wear my hair long, and I can even cry, and I'm a man."

Now, that is a values *revolution* and somehow, even though in the current economic crisis you may think "that is something that was happening in the 60s and 70s and now it's all different;" there were some lasting aspects of the sex role revolution, the values revolution for men and women, that are probably not reversible. . . . I don't think those young men *or* you, who are sitting here, as a result of the sex role revolution, will die 10 years younger than your wives. As the fathers of this generation and their fathers have been doing, from the heart attacks and strokes of their suppressed fears and tears, and the rigors of the definition of masculinity that makes most men feel inadequate, before they even begin, and unnecessarily vulnerable, and says they have to win the rat race to be a man, and says they have to win it all alone. And somehow or other, as we move in the sex role revolution where the two things are locked together; as women move to equality and independence, and freedom and responsibility for their own lives, they liberate men also from that imposed definition of masculinity. And shared burdens of life, in the economic sphere and shared joys and responsibilities in the domestic sphere are what it's all about.

Now, some of this is obscured by current trends in the economy. There have been layoffs, there's a fluctuation in the stock market, there's inflation, and so in the government in a relatively conservative, if not reactionary era, you are beginning to hear noises, "Well, we cannot afford the luxury now of enforcing these programs against sex discrimination, or we've got other things to worry about."

We know from economic history that in times of recession and depression, women and minorities are "last hired, first fired," you can even look at the figures of unemployment today and depending upon whether you really understand what's happening to women in the labor market, you can either think that we had a big crises or no crisis at all. The

fact of the matter is, in terms of the sex role revolution, in terms of the women's movement for equality, and in terms of economic necessity in evolution, there is no way of solving the present economic problems of America by sending the women home again. It is irreversible, the movement of women into the job market. It comes from economic necessity and also from psychological necessity; and the women – what do we say? "How can you keep "them" down on the farm after they've seen Paree." Several generations of women left the farm for the city and are not going back to the farm again. The movement out from the isolation of the home to movement into society even when the job wasn't as good as it should have been, was better than that isolation. The necessity of the woman to be able to pay for shelter, and clothes and travel, and help pay for it when there is a second wage earner in the family, this is irreversible.

There was an article in the *Wall Street Journal* last month which said to Wall Street executives mind you, not just to blue collar or white collar workers, (you know being laid off and feeling the pinch and knowing that they need the wife's paycheck), but, to the Wall Street Journal readers – the question is of Mr. Smith not keeping up with Mr. Jones, but keeping up with *Mr. and Mrs. Jones*, and the family that doesn't have a wife capable of earning a living is just not going to be able to make it the way the economy is going. It's true for economic reasons, psychological reasons, and, said the Wall Street Journal, "If the women went home again, the enormous new resource of the woman's productive earning powers were turned off, this whole economy would collapse." Because one of the whole new sources of energy that is keeping this economy moving and growing, however, you measure it, is the massive influx of women into the labor market. So for this economic reason and reasons of economic, and psychological necessity, you can't turn this one off. Nor can you turn off, it seems to me, the values, that once women have to be dealt in, and deal themselves in as members of society, the values say they demand and assert equality. You can't turn that off. They grow up together, they are educated together, the girls and the boys. Only when you kept women brainwashed with that "Feminine

Mystique" could you keep them from applying their American values to themselves. And now even the wife of the Commanding General of a military base where I spoke recently is going back to school and doing her MA Thesis on the "Uses and Abuses of Army Wives." I cite this example, and be there a woman with soul so dead who is not somehow moved to examine her own situation in terms of the women's movement for equality and the larger revolution? If it is not reversible where on earth is it going to go? You more conventional kinds will say, "how can there be enough jobs with the job market churning as it is? With the service budgets being cut? How are there going to be enough jobs for the women and the men too? Must not the women go home again so the "bread winners" can have a job?" Well, if the bread winners have to have a job, if we are going to give priority to bread winners, a lot of men will have to go home again, because there are more women that are necessarily bread winners, or sole bread winners, than men. More men have a second bread winner in the house, the spouse.

A great many families today, growing numbers of families, are solely supported by women, there *is* no second bread winner. I am not suggesting that this fact be one to be used in layoffs, but if it *were* a valid argument, it would work out today more in the direction of the woman than of the man.

What the actual fact is probably going to be is that we move to an economy of full or maximum employment, that we move to an economy where somehow, the basic value changes implicit in the sex role revolution, implicit in the women's movement, implicit in the energy crisis, implicit in the new ecological awareness; many of these basic value changes be understood in terms of their economic implications and lead to the restructuring of institutions, which perhaps women could never do alone. It would never be done in terms of women alone, but *now* such restructuring meets the needs of women and men and the economy as a whole.

I said that this revolution as far as women are concerned, the economic implications of it, go far beyond women having a few jobs that only men had before. What is involved is also a restructure of the institutions of work. I don't know

precisely how having women in the Air Force Academy is going to restructure this institution, but I submit that it *will* probably restructure this institution or lead to a certain restructure that may not seem apparent at first when you only have a few women here. Then there will be more, and then there will be changed values of the women and the men that go along with this; and there will be some changes that will come about that you can't even anticipate now. But in the larger economy we can already see what some of the changes are.

One of the things that is probably going to happen, and has to happen, I believe, is not women competing with men for a dwindling share of jobs, not women competing with members of labor unions, or black men or heart-attack prone executives for a dwindling number of jobs, but a move toward a shorter work week and more flexible working hours for everyone.

I recently picked up one of the airline magazines, which had a special issue with a lead by Studs Terkel, the Chicago writer on labor, and work, and jobs, on the "American Work Ethic." The title was "Sammy's Not Going to Run Anymore". He cited evidence, and American Management Association Studies show, that although 66 percent of those now in college are career oriented, are vocationally oriented, as you well know, the great trend today is to go to medical school, law schools, I don't know what this nation's going to do with all the doctors and lawyers, but in any event, people suddenly realize they have to have jobs so when they do go to school they need to do something that they are going to earn with. Nevertheless, this study showed that the great majority define *success* not solely in terms of the pay check, but demand satisfaction on the job, satisfaction in work and time for private self fulfillment, for participation in socially significant activities, and for time with the family, that's from the *man's* point of view. From the women's point of view there is the need to participate out in society and yet, for most women, they are going to continue to give birth to children. The latest census shows that while there has been a great drop in the birth rate, primarily it is due to the fact that women are not marrying as young, that so many more

women are at college or at work as before, but there has begun to be an increase in the birthrate in women between ages 25-35. This shows that women are not ceasing to have children, but they will have fewer children because they are beginning later. Well, when women have as a lasting value that they will participate in society, that they must participate for economic reasons, but that they will continue to have children, they also will want more flexible work weeks, shorter hours. It would never be done for women alone, but now it meets convergent needs of women, of men, and of the economy as a whole, including the most efficient use of plants. So this study in the *United Airlines* magazine reported, again from the American Management Association, that there are increasing numbers of companies that have tried, in the US, in Western Europe and other places, a 40 hour work week on *four* days rather than five, with a three-day weekend. Or "flex time", which means that while they put in generally an eight hour day, they come in at a time they set themselves, somewhere between eight and eleven and go home between three and six, and *they* determine their own time shift, not arbitrarily and not changing it every day, but in a flexible way. So that there is a certain core time which everybody is working, but otherwise, flexible. Now all of these trends are restructuring work very much in the interest of women, but also in the interest of men, especially the new young couples. I think this will happen to a lot of you as you begin to make families, the idea that not only the woman works outside the home, but that the man is going to be expected to share the parenting. That is the other half of the sex role revolution. Share the parenting, share the housework, in ways that go beyond just helping in making the French dressing while she cleans out the toilet bowl, real sharing. Not just mother, but mother and father. So that the changes in the hours and the changes in the roles and in the home and in the family will all go along together. Now management reported in this study that it was an enormously more efficient use of equipment and labor. Productivity and satisfaction of workers increased with "flex time" and they looked forward to a future that implied that maybe a 32 hour work week will ultimately be the answer.

That is only one kind of the restructuring that I'm talking about. There is restructuring of work within a given profession, when you break through, what I call the sexual ghetto, that's another economic implication of the movement of women. You will find that secretaries and nurses put a new value on their work; this means not only that women will, instead of just wanting to be nurses, want to be doctors, this doesn't mean only that women will want to be executives not just secretaries; but that somehow there will begin to be a career progression that goes beyond the sexual ghetto. A progression that goes from the most menial work: say in the health profession, hospital worker, or aide, a laboratory assistant, a practical nurse, trained nurse, doctor, administrator, supervisor, there will be a new combination of on the job training and actual work in the profession and academic training. The secretary will no longer be a dead-end job,but will lead also to executive advancement. Even in the State Department, recently, there has been in the last few years a directive sent out that secretaries could no longer be treated as sort of objects with less brains than the typewriter (as one of the more sexist ads puts it,) they can't be sent out for coffee, or to buy a wife's Christmas present, but women are to be treated as people, secretaries are looked at differently, wives of the State Department officials can no longer be at the mercy of the Ambassadors' wives for flower arranging or whatever; and the rule that the women in the State Department has to resign after marriage, all that is changed. It will be very interesting to see what happens with the military. But in any event, the real significance here is, as we begin to move in the sex role revolution, as we begin to move toward real equality, we put a value not only on women getting into work that only men have done before; but, we begin to look in a new way at the work that only women have done before. So the work of the secretary is suddenly valued in a way that it wasn't and it seems that the woman that has been running that office as secretary, once the opprobrium of the sexual ghetto was taken away, could very easily with a little extra confidence, skills or push, be able to run the office and maybe she should be paid more as a secretary, too. And incidentally, there are a great number of

legal secretaries who are now going to law school.

Similarly, the woman that has been saving the patient's life as a nurse; her skills, suddenly in perspective, don't seem so menial as compared to that doctor who couldn't keep that patient alive often without her instruction. She is moving now and demanding to move toward more of a decision making role in the hospital. Similarily, though employment outside the home was the primary focus, and the first focus, of the women's movement, and had to be, now we look back and say "What about the work that women had been doing in the home?" and "What about the women that have been in the home 10, 15, or 25 years?"

We realize the inequity that *that* work has never been valued, even at the minimum wage, when it comes to social security, to old age, to retirement or to automatic entitlement to half the property accumulated by the couple in the marriage if a divorce should take place. For instance the Equal Rights Amendment, and you're going to hear later in this week from Phyllis Schlafly, who's going to tell you that the housewife will be forced out into the job market if the Equal Rights Amendment is passed, and that her husband will no longer support her. Actually, the housewife has very little protection the way it is now, as the statistics are mounting on divorce, and this not because of the women's movement, but because of the longer years that everyone is living and the obsolete sex roles all of our marriages were based on; today one out of three marriages might end in divorce. The woman that has been working in the home, say that they've been married 14 years, and she's been in the home those 14 years, taking care of the children and doing all the other things about the house, and the husband remarries, she isn't entitled to *anything* under social security for those 14 years, for her old age, for her survivors, for anything else. Furthermore, she's not entitled, except in common property states, to get an equal share of what the family accumulated. ERA may enable us to get that sort of thing.

Many economists are now beginning to believe that we can put a measurement both for terms of social security and in terms of the gross national product on those services that have never been measured before, because women were doing

them, but those services are necessary for society. Those are just some of the economic implications of the sex role revolution of this movement of women.

The economy as a whole, as I said before, when I quoted the Wall Street Journal, if the women went home again the economy itself might collapse. There are a lot of economic implications of women's work in society and women's new definition of themselves as people. One of the implications, of course, is that they will not be sitting there idly at the other end of the television set, buying things or easily being sold things that nobody necessarily needs. They will no longer be so easily seduced into believing that there is something orgiastic in throwing a powder into a machine, or that some tiger may jump out, or any other silly nonsense that they need eight million dollars worth of product to trap a man, or keep a man, anything to cover their natural odors or smell, or any of the other ways women have been degraded and exploited in advertising today. But, on the other hand, there will be other markets and new markets for products. If I were an appliance manufacturer I think a lucrative market for women might be an air-conditioning system that simply sucked up the dust automatically, because women will no longer think it's a great virtue to use the vacuum cleaner, to push that vacuum cleaner around every day, that it isn't glamorous even if you wear false eyelashes while you're doing it.

As we make this revolution, there *are* economic changes, there isn't any going back on it, and it's part of the larger revolution of human liberation that we are moving into, where in this country, at this time, we may be on the front edge because of our good fortune, the resources that we've had, because of our tradition of freedom and democracy, and perhaps because we have been exploiting in a way that we will not be able to much longer, the resources of the rest of the world.

We are at least, as an advanced technological society, able to move beyond the strict necessities, where our lives have to be spent keeping our bodies alive, reproducing the race, to where we can live our lives and use the resources of our nation, of our society, for human life worth living for every

man, woman, and child. We are not yet getting a politics or an economics out of Washington from our leaders that fully reflect these new values – which is why so many people like you are beginning, in the cities of this nation, to be turned off by conventional politics, and yet to be vitally concerned with how you are going to live your life. The political implications, of women in the economy, the sex role revolution, are quite large. There's a relationship between the unequal polarized sex roles that we've been living in this country, and elsewhere in western society, and our views toward sex itself, and the predisposition toward violence in our society. Anthropologists and those who have studied history from this point of view can see, that where the sex roles are most polarized, where women and men have related only or primarily in the sexual act alone; in such societies women are denigrated, sex is defined as dirty, and in such societies violence breeds. The dynamics of that, the interrelationships involved, are too complex to go into and they are not fully understood.

In my opinion with all the talk of the *sexual* revolution there won't be real *sexual* liberation, no matter how many manuals are written on 88 ways to make your sex life or your marriage more exciting, or the act of love endurable, or how many technical gadgets are invented, until we get along with the *sex role* revolution and liberate man and woman to full equality from these oppressive sex roles that built in so much hostility and finally make women feel so bad about being women that they can't really love men, and they take it out on men and make it onorous for men to be men, and finally, lock them both in loneliness or in sexual alienation and frustration.

As we move to liberate men and women to true equality in just a sheer mundane sharing of the economic burden, and the burdens and joys of responsibility of the home, then in a certain sense we also liberate women and men to "make love, not war." I believe that part of the reason that we are easily misled into wars is a tendency to violence that comes from our frustrated humanness, our frustrated need for love, and from all the alienation from which men and women are rebelling in this system, and what is going to emerge from it

is a kind of human liberation. I think that this particular revolution, this sex role revolution has to happen in the capitalist system and also has to happen in the communist system. In a certain sense in the communist system, while they needed the women in the labor force, they are behind us on the sex role revolutions, and the economic implications will be somewhat different there than here.

So we are on the front edge of this now and I hope that in the next few days as you get on with the deliberations here you think very concretely and yet in very large terms about what you are discussing and that you realize that the women can't go home again, and that you realize that these values of equality are real, and that you not be mislead, either by a conventional kind of economics that will extrapolate a future that will look like the past, or will treat women in terms of class in society; or misled by the rhetoric that denies the fundamental sexual, psychological, nature of this revolution.

If you get down to the essence of it, and its larger implications, both economic, political, sexual, and psychological, then you will see that we are dealing with one of the most exciting frontiers of this time. The deliberations like you're having here are part of it, because this is not a revolution that has to be fought in the streets or the trenches. It was advanced far by a movement of the last 10 years which used confrontational techniques and others.

In the next 10 years there will be the restructure of the institutions, the creation of what I call "the new yes," in every institution. The creating of "the new yes" is complex and can't be done just by saying no. It has to surmount somehow, the angers that we all feel. I think that these deliberations that you will be having here will be part of that.

SPECIAL FILM AND LECTURE

March 12, 1976

Dr. Antonia Brico

33

Dr. Brico

Antonia Brico, characterized by Jean Sibelius as "a conductor and an artist who understands how to exalt the music and the listeners," was born in The Netherlands.

Brought to this country as a child, she completed her education in California schools. She graduated from the University of California at Berkeley with a degree in music and a major in piano. She served on the University of California summer faculty for a brief period following graduation and was ultimately made a Berkeley Fellow of that school.

Determined to become a conductor, she applied and was accepted at the Master School of Conducting at the Berlin State Academy of Music, University of Berlin. The Berlin School, one of the most demanding and prestigious musical schools of Europe, had not accepted an American student before enrolling the young musician from Oakland.

During the following years Dr. Brico worked diligently at her art, accepting appearances as guest conductor with various American and European orchestras, teaching the hundreds of students piano and conducting classes in various colleges and universities in the art of conducting and the history of opera.

In 1973, Dr. Brico was visited by her onetime piano student Judy Collins, who had abandoned plans for a career as a classical pianist to become one of the most popular singers of her time.

Miss Collins proposed the creation of a documentary film on the fantastic life and career of Dr. Brico. The result was the Academy Award nominated documentary, directed by Judy Collins and Jill Godmilow and produced by Judy Collins for Rocky Mountain Productions, "Antonia: A Portrait of the Woman," which powerfully portrays the life and times of the artist and her unremitting battle to be accepted as an artist rather than a novelty "woman conductor."

The impact of the film caused managers to reexamine the work of Antonia Brico and soon she was again in demand as guest conductor for the most prominent orchestras in the nation.

It has been an exciting career for the artist Bruno Walter called, "a born orchestra conductor" and whom Arthur Rubinstein declared, "has a thorough knowledge and complete mastery of the orchestra."

PANEL DISCUSSION

March 11, 1976

Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly
Chairman, "Stop ERA"

Mrs. Catherine East
Deputy Coordinator of the Secretariat for
International Women's Year

Dr. Peggy Kruger
Equal Opportunity Officer
University of Texas

Dr. Jean Lipman-Blumen
Director of the Women's Research Program
National Institute of Education

Colonel Malham M. Wakin
Chairman
18th AFAA, Moderator

Colonel Wakin

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the second plenary session of the 18th AFA Assembly. After an invigorating initiation of our discussions last evening with Betty Friedan, and the many challenges which were so enthusiastically confronted during the round table sessions today, we are well launched into the complexities of our subject.

Before introducing our distinguished panel members this evening, I think it is only fair to respond to those who have so politely inquired about the qualifications of a male philosophy professor to moderate an all woman panel on "Women and the American Economy" since it is obvious that I'm neither a woman or an economist.

If one were to select a moderator from the last bastion of male chauvanism, a label for the Academy contained in today's Colorado Springs Sun report of Ms. Friendan's press conference yesterday, if one were to do that at least, perhaps a philosopher is a safe choice, if he can be counted on to seek the middle ground during conflicting opinions. But I claim a much more personal interest in the topic, based on the fact that I'm the father of five daughters, have been a widower for over two years, and have experienced the challenge of handling a busy job and an active household as a single parent. Two of those daughters, incidentally, are in the process of making their debut in the American economy and no one could be more interested than I in what the future holds for them.

Well, we are extremely fortunate in having with us tonight a group of scholarly women, each of whom has had significant personal experiences in the American economy; and each of whom has been engaged in serious study and activities related to our conference's topic.

We have made available to you a detailed biography for each panelist, which you have, so I will simply highlight a few facts for you in my introductions.

On my far right is Ms. Catherine East, who currently is serving as Deputy Coordinator of the Secretariat for International Womens Year. She has been Executive

Secretary of the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, has worked for the US Civil Service Commission, was an advisor to the US delegation to the 1973 meeting of the Inter-American Commission on women, and to the International Women's Year World conference in Mexico City in 1975. Her expert knowledge on the subject of this conference has caused her to be in great demand as a lecturer both in this country and overseas, which includes testimony regarding employment discrimination before a select committee of the British House of Lords.

On my immediate right is Dr. Peggy Kruger, who comes to us from the University of Texas in Austin, where she is the university's equal employment opportunity officer. Dr. Kruger holds a BA and MA in French and spent an academic year studying at the Sorbonne. Her PhD is in educational administration and she has held various academic posts including positions at Loyola of Chicago, Rockhurst College, South Western Texas State, El Centro College, and now at the University of Texas. During a stint with the Peace Corps, she worked in a preventative medicine program in West Africa. She works closely with federal equal opportunity employment agencies and has served on the planning committee of the equal employment opportunity of the national conference of Christians and Jews.

On my immediate left is Dr. Jean Lipman-Blumen, who is a senior research associate and Director of the Women's Research Program for the National Institute of Education. Dr. Lipman-Blumen received her BA and MA degrees from Wellesley, her PhD in sociology from Harvard. Additionally, she has held post-doctoral fellowships at Carnegie-Melon and Stamford University in Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science. She has served as senior medical sociologist at the Stamford Research Institute and as a director of a major research project with the Radcliffe Institute. Her expert services have been utilized by a large number of professional groups, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the International Sociological Association. She is the author of a number of scholarly articles, many directly relevant to the topic of this conference. We are doubly indebted to Jean for

serving both as a moderator for our round table discussions and as a member of this panel.

Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly is seated on my far left. Mrs. Schlafly's formal education includes a BA from Washington University in St Louis, and an MA in Political Science from Harvard and she told me tonight, she is currently attending law school. She is the author of a twice weekly newspaper column which is carried by several papers, a monthly newsletter called the Phyllis Schlafly report, a number of books including *A CHOICE NOT AN ECHO* and co-author with Admiral Chester Ward of several other books, including a 1975 work entitled *KISSINGER ON THE COUCH*. Mrs. Schlafly is an extremely popular lecturer on college campuses, and before varied organizations throughout the US. She has been featured in television interviews and debates on the major networks, and does a twice weekly radio program for CBS. She is the recipient of a number of distinguished awards from national organizations for her contributions to public affairs. Well, there we have a thumbnail sketch of each of our expert players. Now for the rules of the game.

Each panelist will have 10 minutes to develop her perspective on 'WOMEN AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY' I ask them to assist us generally in the conference by dealing at least in part with some of the issues we have specified for discussion in tomorrows' third and fourth round table sessions. After all four presentations, we will allow a maximum of five minutes from each for a rejoinder. At the end of these rejoiners we will have a brief stretch break before reconvening to provide you, our delegates, an opportunity for dialogue with the panel members.

Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly

Regretfully, I feel that I must begin by filing a protest against the biased and non-objective presentation of women's issues during this conference. I note that your keynote

speaker and your banquet speaker are two of the most prominent women in the country who favor ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. One of them put it through Congress; the other founded the organization which is the leading proponent of the Equal Rights Amendment. No contrary views were allowed in those major speeches, and we are relegated to just one fourth of this panel. The proponents quite generally do not accord equal rights to those who are opposed to the Equal Rights Amendment.

I read your manual prepared for this conference and I noticed that there is a big plug for ERA, but nothing giving the arguments against it. There is nothing in this manual which presents a point of view opposite to what is popularly known as the "women's liberation movement." I also noticed your bibliography prepared for this conference. It consists of 415 entries, not a single one of which presents what you might call the "non-women's lib" approach to women's issues.

As a former librarian, I must protest this type of thought control and book-burning attitude which does not give a fair presentation to the opposing points of view. There are many differences between the "pro-women's lib" and the "anti-women's" points of view which I feel are worthy of discussion.

Those who are for the Equal Rights Amendment operate from the premise that women in the United States are oppressed, that they have been discriminated against for the last 200 years, and that we should now have a Constitutional amendment to remedy this oppression.

Please consider the fact that there are many of us who believe that, of all the classes of people who ever lived, American woman is the most fortunate. She has the most opportunities and the most choices to direct her life any way she wants.

The women's lib movement presents the idea that there's something terribly unequal and degrading about mothers being expected to take care of their babies, and that this burden should be taken off their backs by state nurseries, in order that the women can be out fulfilling themselves in the work force. I think our young women here should know that,

for some of us, taking care of small babies is the most fulfilling and enjoyable thing a woman can do. I have done many interesting things, but there is nothing as much fun as taking care of a little baby.

The women's lib movement operates from the assumption that women need to be "liberated" from the home and sent out into the work force where they can fulfill themselves. The big majority of women find their greatest fulfillment is in the home.

The women's lib movement would tell you that there are no physical differences between men and women, that all those differences that you think you see are just due to societal restraints and stereotyped education which we plan on getting rid of. There are some of us who still think that girls and boys cannot play football or wrestle equally together. There are physical differences – in fact men and women can't even play tennis and golf equally together.

Finally, the proponents of the women's lib movement operate from the premise that the Federal Government is the solution to these problems therefore they support ERA. Section 2, which gives Congress the power to enforce ERA through appropriate legislation, would take it out of the hands of the states and give to the Federal Government the last remaining bit of jurisdiction that the Washington politicians have not yet got their meddling fingers into, including marriage, property law, divorce, child custody, prison regulations, insurance rates, and protective labor legislation.

The effect of Section 2 is why the principal impetus for this new demand for ERA comes from the employees of the Federal Government who see a whole new area of jurisdiction coming under their control, with more staff and more control, and more ways to dictate our lives. They have been pushing ERA for years in the status of Women Council in Department of Labor. Now they have fixed themselves up with something called International Women's Year Commission with a budget this year of $300,000 of our tax money. Commission members are currently working for an appropriation of $5,000,000 for next year and they have made the ratification of ERA their number-one priority. This

is an attempt to use the taxpayers' money to cram ERA down our throats whether we want it or not. I think the evidence shows that women don't want ERA.

The Equal Rights Amendment is basically and fundamentally an attack on the legal rights of the wife and the mother in the home. It will take away the right of a wife to be supported by her husband, to be provided with a home by her husband, to get credit in her husband's name, to draw Social Security benefits based on her husband's earnings. These are the rights we give to a wife because we honor the role of homemaker, and because we do respect the family as the basic unit of our society.

I'm intrigued by one of the questions on the panel for discussion tonight. "Should some fringe benefits, Social Security for example, be provided for persons doing homework?" You should know that Social Security is one of the most pro-woman institutions that exists in our country today. The woman who has made her career in the home as wife and mother can still draw Social Security benefits based on her husband's earnings, even though she never was in the work force, or even though she was only in the work force a few years of her life. A mandate of strict equality would take away this right of the homemaker wife to draw Social Security benefits based on her husband's earnings.

Another one of the questions proposed for discussion tonight is "What are the requisites for sex equality in the work force?" You have to make a basic distinction between two types of people in the work force. I think that a woman can compete equally with a man in intellectual, professional, business, or academic pursuits because she is just as smart; but a woman cannot compete equally with a man in jobs that require physical labor. Most reasonable people see the physical differences between men and women. We have grown up in a country in which we make allowances for these physical differences. You see this in the military – our country has fought nine wars and we have never felt it necessary to put our young women in combat just like the men. You see it in the police force, and you see it in factory work. If you want to find out the people who don't want equality, talk to the women who work in the factories of our

country, and who now are feeling the brunt of the new Federal laws that demand absolute equality, which means that the company and the union can treat them just like men. They don't want to be treated just like men. The industries or our country are kept going with all kinds of jobs which are heavy, dangerous, and unpleasant. Women don't want to be assigned to most of those jobs.

A great change is coming over the men in the factories of our country today. They are saying, in effect, to these women, "Well, sister, if you want equality, we'll give it to you in spades." To appease a few militant women, the majority of the women in our factories today are being made unhappy by being assigned to men's jobs which they don't want and aren't physically capable of doing. Their only alternative is to quit and, if they quit, they don't even get their unemployment compsensation.

You have to recognize a basic difference between the physical jobs and the intellectual or mental jobs. I believe that people are entitled to make reasonable differences between the sexes based on the reasonable differences that do exist between men and women.

If you think that is a great injustice, you'll have to take up your complaint with God. I don't know of anybody else who can solve that problem. We were made different and we are entitled to reflect this in our laws.

We do make differences in our country based on other characteristics. For example, we do not have quality based on age. An 18-year-old can vote and a 17-year-old cannot vote. Wouldn't it be ridiculous to say "equal rights cannot be denied or abridged on account of age?" If we had such a ridiculous law, then children could vote all the way down to the cradle because they are citizens just as much as anybody else.

We also have differences based on income. We give people below a certain income food stamps, or housing benefits, or scholarships to colleges. People above a certain income are discriminated against and can't get those benefits. It is not equality, but it is justice when we make differences between certain groups. Likewise most of us do see differences between men and women which we are entitled to reflect in

our school system, in our colleges, in the work force, in the military, and in many other areas.

These are some of the reasons why there were 17 state legislatures that rejected the Equal Rights Amendment last year, and two states that rejected it by referendum. Despite all of the loaded, biased, and non-objective presentations that have been given on this subject in the media, nevertheless, the American people recognize ERA as a phoney and they're against it. I hope, in spite the limited time our side has on this program, that you will give consideration to the positive view of the American woman.

Dr. Lipman-Blumen

Lifestyles are reflected in demographic trends. Women are living longer, marrying later and less often, remarrying less frequently, having and expecting to have fewer children and more often planning not to have any children. The drop in the fertility rate of women between the ages of 18 and 29 is related to the increased age of women when they are first married, their increased educational attainment, their increased participation in the labor force, and to the fact that more women live in metropolitan residences.

The divorce rate continues to increase today. The first-marriage rate began to decline after World-War II and continued to decline during the 60s and 70s. Divorce and remarriage rates began to rise around 1960 and continued to increase during that decade. By 1970, divorce and remarriage rates were the highest ever recorded. Since then the divorce rate has continued to climb, but the remarriage rate has leveled off and is declining. In 1974, the number of divorces was 970,000 (6.2 percent increase over 1973). Overall, divorce continues to affect low-income groups the most, but even this is beginning to change. There is a convergence of divorce in all socio-economic status levels. The average number of children per divorce degree is declining and there is an increase in inter-racial marriage.

Female Headed Families: More often than before, both

young and older females are living alone. Women increasingly head families. In 1972, 14 percent of all families with children had a female head. This was a 40 percent increase since 1960. This increase has occurred among both white and black, poor and not-so-poor families.

The median annual income for female-headed families with children under 18 is $4,000 versus $11,600 for all families with children under 18.

Contraceptive measures have reduced marital and nonmarital birth rates, but nonmarital births among teenagers is declining at a slower pace. Current census surveys find that women are planning to have somewhat less than two children each. Postponement of childbearing, rather than permanent rejection, has become more prevalant.

Educational Trends: Education is a potential contributor to changing sex roles and lifestyles. So far, the results from education have proven disappointing. The Carnegie Commission has found that, since 1900, females have been less likely to enter college, despite the fact that they are more likely than men to complete secondary school. In 1971, females earned only 14 percent of all the doctoral degrees granted.

Boys and girls enter primary school in approximately equal numbers. In their earlier years, girls get better grades and are more likely to be enrolled in a grade above the mode at age 13. They are less likely to be underachievers until puberty. The proportion of females enrolled in school during each age level between the ages of 14 and 24 is less than that of men. By the time they enter college, there is a drop in the number of female students, despite the fact that females do better in school up to that point.

Some overall gains for women in education have occurred. In 1960, 1,325,849 females were enrolled in higher educational institutions. By 1970, this enrollment had increased to 3,675,000 females. Black females are closing the educational gap faster than white females.

Women are not a monolithic group; therefore, there is need to construct solutions for different groups.

A great deal of attention is being given to homemakers. Congresswoman Yvonne Burke and Congressman John V. Tunney currently are sponsoring a Displaced Homemakers

Bill (S.2353 and S.2541). Homemakers need the most help because they have accepted the vicarious achievement ethic. They have been socialized to be vicarious achievers. There is a great need to teach females to be direct achievers and to structure institutions and social policy to help females in this way.

What educational policies are suggested by these changes?

1) We need to develop non-sex biased curricula, books, and other materials from the earliest grades in school.

2) We need to examine the factors which influence females to underachieve beginning in puberty.

3) We need to develop special guidance programs to move more women into post-secondary education (college and vocational training).

4) We need to apprise females of the strong likelihood of their adult need to work and to develop preparatory programs towards this goal. Career awareness must begin in the early grades in school.

5) We need to develop more programs to train women as educational administrators.

6) We need to develop fellowships and scholarship programs for women at the undergraduate and graduate levels of education.

7) We need to develop flexible college credit transfer programs to help women who must move because of their husbands' jobs.

Current Status of Financial Aid: An estimated $4 billion in financial aid has been awarded to students in the last few years for college costs. Existing programs include:

a) Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (This provides up to $1400 for each undergraduate year for full-time college students attending approved post-secondary institutions for the first time.)

b) Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program for exceptional financial need.

c) National Direct Student Loans (National Defense

Student Loans).

d) Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

e) College Work-Study Program.

f) Federal Aid for Vocational Education.

g) Career Education for entering previously all male roles.

We need to set requirements so that as many average females as average males have opportunities. This includes the need to expand programs for the re-entry of the adult learner. Mondale's Life-Long Learning Bill is a good example. The female (and the male) workers of the 70s and 80s will be more educated. There is the need to develop educational policies that will enable women to compete in the highly competitive job market of today and tommorrow.

Dr. Kruger

As we discuss women and their treatment in the labor force, I'm reminded of the story of the woman who said that she very much liked to have her cigarettes lit, her door opened, and her coat put on, but that it was not worth the $4000 difference in pay. Eventually you come to those types of choices. First, I would like to clear up a point which I think is very important when one talks about "women's liberation," and the "women's liberation point-of-view." I think you have to be very careful that you don't assume that there is one point of view in the women's liberation movement or one definition. I found this out one day when one of my very assertive friends, whom I thought was probably much more of a women's liberationist than I, said closely, "Are you a women's liber?" I said "Yes," she said "Well, I just couldn't be!" I said, "Well, Mary why not?" "Well, I just can't go out on dates with other men when my husband is out of town?" That certainly had *not* been my definition of women's liberation! I have learned to ask people to define Women's Lib and what they mean before answering.

My own personal definition and one that I endorse is that Women's Liberation involves the increasing of choices for

people, both for women and for men. As Mrs. Schlafly has indicated, women in the United States are very lucky. In fact, men in the United States are also extremely fortunate. Since we have been given so many opportunities, our task now is to improve and refine our system so it works even better. My definition of "Women's Liberation" is an effort to increase the opportunities for *people* to work and to carry out life styles that reflect their own particular desires, and their talents, their potentials, their merits, ability, and the little bit of luck that always comes into living. People should not be forced into stereotyped positions in marriages, in jobs, in family or social relationships that are unbecoming and destructive to that individual.

Mrs. Schlafly talks about "the government" as if it were not composed of people. If you consider that the "government" is not something that just comes out of Washington, but it is a government for the people, by the people, of the people, and thus reflects the desires of many people, then these government programs, such as the one I'm working in Equal Employment Opportunity, are programs that are tools to carry out policies made by the *people of the United States.*

In the early 60s we said that we would not practice or allow discrimination in employment, in housing and in many areas of life, based on race or sex. This is a national policy. The President put forth executive orders that said if we are going to spend federal monies, we spend federal monies in keeping with federal policy which forbid discrimination. Therefore, an institution such as the one I work for, The University of Texas at Austin, receiving 32 million dollars of federal aid for grants and contracts, signs a contract. This contract says we will not discriminate, we will practice Equal Employment Opportunity, and we will practice something called Affirmative Action. These are programs that are designed to increase the participation of women and minorities, in an institution something that is already *status quo*, it's really just letting in more people to what's there. We're not talking about revolutions, but letting them in on the jobs that are already there.

Incidentally I wanted to point out since role models were

being discussed, that the President of The University of Texas at Austin is Dr. Lorene Rogers. She is one of the few female presidents in the United States, of colleges or institutions. She is the only female president of a major institution such as U.T. that has 40,000 students. I have the pleasure to have a good role model in front of me.

What is Equal Employment Opportunity? Equal Employment Opportunity says that you won't have anything in your employment policy or practices that deny a person a job based on an irrelevant, non job-related characteristic. Somebody once said facetiously that the only bonafide job-related qualifications for sex was either sperm donor or milk nurse. There are some people who will disagree with you on that, and perhaps that is a little extreme, but you can get that extreme if you want to look at it. What objective do you have in this job? What is really needed to perform this job? And try to look at it in that light as opposed to all the traditional things that have led up to people saying that a woman cannot be a plumber because she doesn't have the manual dexterity, there are studies that show that women have more manual dexterity. Equal Employment Opportunity programs should wipe out everything that says you have certain systems for women, other, usually better, systems for men; that you pay different rates based on sex, not performance; that women aren't allowed here! You treat employees based on job-related performance, not personal prejudice.

Affirmative Action says that you will do more than *not* discriminate: you will make *additional efforts* to recruit, employ, and to promote qualified members of groups that have been previously discriminated against. This can extend into getting males into nursing schools, and primary school teaching. What you do in Affirmative Action is that you make *additional efforts* first to recruit. You do more than open the door, you seek out people to tell them that the door is open and invite them in.

For example, the PhD program that I graduated from went along for 20 years with only two females in it. Finally, when they decided that they needed some women because they were getting some federal monies, they had to do some very

active recruiting because a lot of women were not standing at the door waiting to be let in, because they knew that door had been shut for many, many years.

There's nothing in the Affirmative Action laws or regulations, as they apply to institutions which automatically give preferential treatment to women or minorities. Many people think that if you're a woman and a minority you've got it made now. Some people interpret it that way. The law is very specific; when you hire, you hire the best qualified person in that pool, but you have to make efforts to really bring women and minorities into that pool. When your top candidates are women and minorities and perhaps white males and you have previously shown that you have a deficit in your area based on the labor market, at that point you would opt for the woman or the minority, and that's where you get into the side-area of reverse discrimination. Many people ask me about reverse discrimination. I usually say that I have not seen enough of it happening yet to even worry about it. I'm more worried about getting up to that point. When we get to that point, then we may have really gotten someplace and we might be able to relax and let things take their natural course. I find that a lot of other people working in this area say that that's true too. There are employers who write letters to white males who are prospective applicants that say, "I'm sorry but we cannot even consider you because your ancestry does not fit into our equal employment opportunity program, which angers all white males, and *should* anger white males." If you look very closely at that very person who wrote the letter, he's interpreted the law in an illegal and incorrect manner, and he's also probably about to hire a white male. One of the biggest problems in the area of equal employment opportunity is the amount of misinformation that spreads and is very harmful to these programs. Another major problem involves the recognition that discrimination, especially sex discrimination in employment, has or does really *exist*! Many people refuse to recognize the problem, much less work on solutions.

Higher education is unique in that it is more than AT & T, it's more than just an employer. Higher education institutions

are employers, that's true. Women traditionally have had lower status, they start out at a lower pay rate even though they have equivalent qualifications within 5 years doing the same things where there is a $2000 differential in pay, and you can only attribute it to the fact that one is female and one is male.

However, institutions of higher education are not only employers, but they also provide the ladder up in our society; that's where you find role models, that's where you gain the tools to practice your science or art. Institutions of higher educations, as I see it, have an extra obligation to really work on their Equal Employment Opportunity and their Affirmative Action Programs, even more than AT & T. Perhaps that's unfair, but that's one of my particular views. I don't think that institutions of higher education have been that successful at this point. There has been some success.

The bright young males and females sitting in this audience, are proof there has been change, there has been a success rate. But these changes are slow in coming. The roles of females and males in our society are changing in many, many ways. Change is taking place in homes and in offices. However, we need to continue to make effective and consistent efforts to increase the employment opportunities available to people based on their merit and not on their sex.

Thank you.

Ms. East

Many opponents of the ERA, like many other Americans, are victims of the press' concept of the women's movement. Because of the lack of balanced press coverage, it's only those involved in the women's movement who understand the extent and depth of it, the variety of goals and the variety of the groups involved. There's no one organization that is the women's movement and no one person who leads it.

Some of the groups that have been very actively involved in bringing about the changes in the society that have taken place in the last 15 years are the American Association of

University Women, the Americans Home Economics Association, B'nai B'rith Women, Church Women United, Ecumenical Task Force on and Women and Religion, State and City Commissions on the Status of Women, the League of Women Voters, the Methodist Women, the YWCA, and the Presbyterian Women. The National Federation of Professional and Business Women's Clubs, which was founded in 1920, had endorsed the ERA long before NOW existed and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which was provided even earlier, NOW is not the author nor the chief proponent of the ERA, nor are they a revolutionary group in the way implied by opponents.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton in 1870 stated well the goals of the women who are active in the women's movement, and many of them are homemakers. In fact, my observation of the lobbying in the Congress for the ERA indicated that it was practically all done by homemakers. Most professional women can't leave their jobs to go lobbying. Elizabeth Cady Stanton in 1870 stated the goals – full partnership for women in the State, the church, and the home. And I think that full partnership in the home is as important a goal of the women's movement as full partnership in any other aspect of society.

All of the Federal government commissions on the status of women, and I've worked for all of them, opted for full partnership for women in the home, and all recognized that women do not now have it under present law. Now the media never picked that up, and most unfortunately neither have the State Legislatures because they are made up of men who like things the way they are.

It is no accident that former Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, who was the chief proponent of the ERA, has also been the chief proponent of homemakers. She is the Chair of the Committee on the Homemaker of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. She, as a lawyer, former judge, and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in the Congress, where welfare and tax problems are taken up, has long recognized that the woman in the home, the homemaker, is the most vulnerable person in society and the most discriminated against. A

number of the National Commission's recommendations relate to improving the legal status of the homemaker.

The economic and legal effects of the ERA are already well under way in our society. The effects are not something that will all take place when the ERA is ratified or 2 years later when it is effective. The Congress, sensitive to the political implications of the women's movement, began passing the legislation needed to carry out the ERA within a few months after the amendment passed Congress. Many states have already amended their laws, some of them or all of them, to conform to the ERA, and a number have added amendments to their State constitutions, including Colorado.

In order to discuss rationally the impact of the ERA we must have at least an elementary understanding of what it is and what it requires. Because I want to speak about the positive aspects, I'm not going to refute what Mrs. Schlafly has said: she rarely says anything about it that's factually accurate. If any of the things she said has stuck with you as something that might be true ask me in the question period, and I will give you the full facts. One cannot debate with her on equal time because telling the full facts takes two or three times as long as making a wild statement about something. I know what the ERA will do to the Social Security Act, but it will take me three times as long to make an accurate statement on what it will do for women and their families than it takes her to say the ERA will take benefits away from women.

The ERA is a statement of principle, like many of the great guarantees of personal freedom in the constitution, for example, freedom of speech and freedom of religion. The ERA announces to all the world in clear terms, that the concept of equality, expressed in the Declaration of Independence, is a bit closer to reality. We have spent most of our history trying to bring the ideals in the Declaration of Independence to fruition, and this is one of the last steps; women are one of the last groups to be guaranteed equality under the law, as they were one of the last groups to be given the vote.

Another important feature of our system of government is illustrated by the ERA – the inter-relationship between the

co-equal legislative and judicial branches of government. In interpreting the ERA, the courts will try to carry out the intent of the legislative framers. This principle is followed by the courts in interpreting all legislation. It is of greatest importance in interpreting the Constitution and its amendments because much of the language in the Constitution is in terms of general principle, and more subject to interpretation than other legislation. Because they knew the courts would be studying their views in interpreting the ERA, the chief proponents in the Congress were very careful to state their intent very clearly, both in committee reports and in the debates. The legislative history of the ERA is probably the most comprehensive and soundly based of any of the Constitutional amendments. The ERA reads as follows:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

Note particularly the phrase "under the law." It is very important. The ERA does not apply to private relationships or to private employment or to private education. It would apply to what the Government does – Federal, State, and local. It therefore, applies to laws, public employment, and public education, and says to all branches and levels of Government, "you shall not discriminate on account of sex."

Perhaps the most important tangible economic impact will flow from the application to public education, including elementary and secondary schools, community colleges and technical schools, State colleges, and universities, military schools operated by the Government, such as this one, and the "man-power" training programs of the Government. In all of these areas there have been varying degrees of discrimination because of sex, from refusal to admit any women at all, to admission quotas, to discrimination in participation in classes.

One of the most flagrant discriminations in public education, particularly at the elementary and secondary level has been in sports, which I submit have a much more profound impact on the economic status of women than is immediately apparent. It is in sports that men have learned in

team efforts to blend competition and cooperation. They learn how to win without arrogance and lose without loss of self-respect, they learn to lead and follow, and to work as a team. These are valuable lessons for success in all of our powerful institutions where women's voices have been lacking in the past.

Our military academies give great weight to participation in sports in their admissions criteria, not only because of the physical development sports promote, but also, and more importantly, the leadership skills they promote.

As I indicated earlier, the Congress began passing legislation to implement the ERA, immediately following its passage. Title IX, of the Education Amendments of 1972, enacted a few months after the ERA passed Congress, was a major step forward in requiring equal opportunity in education. Title IX went further than the ERA would require, in that it applies to some private colleges that receive Federal financial assistance. It didn't go as far in its application to public schools as the ERA would require, since it does not require that elementary and secondary schools be open to both sexes. There are still in some states, public elementary and secondary schools restricted to one sex; and in all these cases that have come to the public attention, the girls' schools, as you can guess, provide less opportunity than those for boys.

Another very important economic impact of the ERA will result from opening up the military services to women. The benefits of military service are many, particularly to youngsters from disadvantaged homes. Herbert Stein of the Economic Advisors in testifying in 1973 before the Joint Economic Committee, suggested that the widening gap in women's and men's wages in the past 20 years was partially due to the GI bill. It was also said in those hearings that since WWII a total of 17 million persons had been enrolled under VA educational programs; only 1.8 percent of these were women. The military services have been an avenue of upward mobility for poor boys for many generations but not for girls. For example, the first black mayor of Cleveland attributed his education and subsequent career to being drafted in WWII when his family was on welfare. One

wonders what happened to his sisters.

The military services too, in response to the pressures of the ERA, have raised their quotas and opened up more assignments to women, but women are still waiting to get in, women that are meeting higher standards than men being enlisted. The ERA would bring about substantial change, probably not full parity, because the resistance of military services to full equality of opportunity will probably be upheld by the courts. The Commander in Chief has a constitutional right, which would have to be weighed against the constitutional right of women, to assign personnel. As many of you know you lose a great many civilian freedoms when you come into the military service. Not all the constitutional guarantees apply to you in the same way they do to a civilian.

The women in the home will probably benefit more from the ERA than anyone else, because in the legislative history there is a statement that a homemaker's contribution, whether it be a man or woman, is equivalent to the providing spouses' contribution. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court, under their State ERA, has already held that in divorce a wife is entitled to half the personal property even though the husband paid for it. Prior to the ERA the husband got the personal property because he paid for it. This is a strong indication, moving in the right direction, that the contribution of a woman in the home entitles her to half the property even though she never worked outside the home. The ERA will require that former husbands in a divorced family contribute to child support in accordance with their means. Under present law, as it is applied, men by and large are asked to contribute less than half to the support of the children in divided families, and former wives are collecting child support regularly in fewer than half the cases where it is due.

I shall be glad to answer any questions relating to the ERA.

ROUND-TABLE AGENDA

Eighteenth Air Force Academy Assembly

WOMEN AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY:
A Bicentennial Appraisal

First Session

The Move: From Home Work to Market Work

1. What are the major factors accounting for the continuous increases in women's labor force activity during the last half century? How have these same forces affected the work patterns of men?

2. How has the tradition of not pricing services provided in the home (teaching, household services, nursing) affected the prices paid for the same or similar services when they are offered in the market?

3. To what extent do women's lower job status and pay reflect supply factors (intermittency, inexperience, less consistent performance) and in what degree inaccurate employer perception of women's relative competence, opposition to work by married women, historical precedent?

4. What changes in attitudes of various groups (employers, educational and religious leaders, the media, men and women themselves) have accompanied—or preceded or followed—the growth in market work by women? What are current attitudes on women who work, particularly married women?

5. How are changes in women's work roles affecting labor force mobility and work schedules?

Second Session

The Impact: Gains, Losses, and Tradeoffs

1. Since women's work in the home carries no price tag, its worth to the family cannot easily be compared with the

dollar value of their market jobs. By what criteria does a society or a family evaluate the gains and losses that result from a change in the type of work performed by women?

2. It is clear that in order to lift their incomes above the poverty level, many families must rely on the wife's earnings. Should social policy encourage work by these women even when they have preschool children?

3. Should industry and nonbusiness employers attempt to reschedule work and provide more parttime jobs for men and women? What would be the advantages and disadvantages?

4. What are the interrelationships between women's increased market work and declining fertility? Between women's work and the rate of divorce?

5. What conclusions can be drawn with regard to the impact of mothers' market work on the quality of home life and child care and ultimately on the well-being of the adult population?

Third Session

Some Implications:
Aspirations, Equality, and Market Behavior

1. As women assume more significant proportions of certain professions (law, medicine, the ministry, academic administration), how will the goals, procedures, and performance of these professions be affected? Will productivity in the professions and in industry increase or decrease?

2. What are the requisites for sex equality in the work force? To what extent would present inequality be corrected by equal pay for equal work and to what extent does the problem spring from lack of access to better jobs. What is a reasonable time table for achieving equal opportunity in the labor market?

3. How will a continued increase in the proportion of women who work affect the distribution of income between high, middle, and low income groups? Should the tax mechanism be used to reduce family income differentials if working patterns lead to less even distributions?

4. If market work is to be shared more evenly between the sexes, what are the implications for home work? Should dollar values be imputed to work done in the home? Should some fringe benefits (Social Security, for example) be provided for persons doing home work?

Fourth Session

The Future: Economic Performance and Economic Policy

1. If the economy moves into a slow-growth period, what policies would help to maintain the gains in real income achieved during the preceding decade? What are the potential contribution of women, in particular? How can this potential be assured?

2. What further actions, if any, are needed to reduce sex differentials in earning? What is the proper domain of government and what is the corporate role?

3. How should complaints of reverse discrimination be evaluated? When is seniority and when is the affirmative action goal to be honored?

4. What ought to be governmental and corporate policy on the provision of day care for children of working parents? Who should pay?

5. What changes in educational policy and emphasis are suggested by the new lifestyles of men and women?

ROUND TABLE A

Dr. Jean Lipman-Blume
Director, Women's Research Program
National Institute of Education

Dr. Lipman-Blumen received her AB from Wellesley College in 1954, an AM from Wellesley in 1958 and a PhD in Sociology from Harvard in 1970. She was also a Post-Doctoral Fellow in Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science at Carnegie-Mellon and Stanford Universities from 1970-1972. Dr. Lipman-Blumen is now a Senior Research Associate and Director of the Women's Research Program of the National Institute of Education where she is responsible for the development and conduct of all in-house research on women, as well as for the conceptual development of the entire extra mural research in this area.

Delegates

Cleora Adams	Oregon State
Lucy Batton	Northern Colorado
Bobbie Britsch	Texas A&M
Rick Carstens	USNA
Tom Fronk	USAFA
Judith Garvey	San Francisco
Evan Haberman	VMI
Glen Hanus	USAFA
Holly Harding	Nebraska
Terri Lazar	Indiana
Rich Mintz	USAFA
Phyllis Brinson	Loretto Heights
Elaine Nash	Univ of Colorado, Colo Spgs
Juneau Shepard	Houston
Donna Zilka	Princeton

ROUND TABLE B

Ms. Louise T. Conner
Professor of Political Science,
Colorado University

Ms. Conner attended Law School from 1938 to 1949 at the University of Minnesota Law School. She was a State Senator to the Delaware General Assembly from 1964 to 1972. There she chaired the Education Committee and the Health and Social Services Committee. She also sponsored and secured ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment to the US Constitution. Ms. Conner has coordinated a workshop on Womanpower and Politics to be given March 6, 1976, under the joint sponsorship of the University of Colorado, the League of Women Voters of Denver, the Junior League of Women Voters of Denver, the Junior League of Denver, and the Colorado Women's Political Caucus.

Delegates

Maura Abeln	Vassar
Marla Borowski	Colorado College
Kevin Cullan	USMMA
Janet Doty	Rice
Bob Gardner	USAFA
Meg Griffin	Montana State
Phil Heyl	USCGA
Carla Lindorff	Western State College
Craig Manson	USAFA
Jeff Mulliner	USNA
Denise Rozell	Occidental
Paul Valverde	Univ Colorado, Denver
Vonna Viglione	North Carolina
Ro Vigna	Adams State
Jim Welshans	USAFA

60

ROUND TABLE C

Major Leslie G. Denend, USAF
Assistant Professor of Economics and Management, USAF Academy, Colorado

Major Denend was a Distinguished Graduate from the Air Force Academy in 1963. He attended Bonn University on a Fulbright Scholarship in Economics. He received his MBA in Urban Management from Stanford in 1973 and is now a candidate for a PhD in Economics, Public Policy, and Business. Prior to assuming his present position as Assistant Professor of Economics and Management at the Academy, Major Denend was a White House Fellow, serving as Executive Assistant to the Director of the Council on International Economic Policy where he was concerned with the formulation, coordination, and implementation of US international economic policy.

Delegates

John Acton	USCGA
Brian Carney	USAFA
Joni Costanza	Southern Colorado
Steve Dee	USAFA
Rich DeLauter	St Mary's of Texas
Lee Ann Allen	BYU
Bill Jones	USAFA
Jean Koza	Pittsburgh
Leslie Levin	Northwestern
Lynne McCrudden	Colorado Women's College
Pat Nevitt	USNA
Madeline Shea	Cal Tech
Gary Shoesmith	Kansas State
Mary Weisheupl	Denver University
Deborah Leiderman	Harvard

ROUND TABLE D

Ms. Margaret J. Gates
Attorney and Co-Director, Center for Women Policy Studies, Washington, DC

Ms. Margaret Gates is an attorney and Co-Director of the Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, DC, which she helped found shortly after receiving her law degree from Georgetown University Law Center in 1971. Her work at the Center has involved research, action projects and litigation in several specific issues in the area of women's rights including: sex discrimination in credit practices, women in policing and women in the military services. In addition to her position at the Center, Ms. Gates teaches the course "Women in the Law" at the Georgetown University Law Center. She serves as a Member of the Fund for Constitutional Government, the Women's Equity Action League Educational and Legal Defense Fund, and the Clearinghouse on Women's Issues.

Delegates

Cynthia Boshard	Utah
Bill Brundage	USAFA
Jim Carasano	USMA
Rory Childress	USAFA
Ed Gallagher	USAFA
Steve Gallahan	VMI
Izzy Hatcher	New Mexico
Martha Johnson	Berkeley
Kathy Ligocki	Indiana
Corby Locke	Wyoming
Tricia Mauro	Kenyon
Laura Pinkston	Kansas
Kim Schafer	Regis
Donna Schmidt	Fort Hays State
John Sloan	Baylor

ROUND TABLE E

Mr. William Shapiro
Asst Professor of Political Science,
Kenyon College

Mr. Shariro received his BA from Brooklyn College in 1968 and MA from Cornell University in 1973, and he is presently working on his doctoral dissertation. He teaches a course on "Women in Politics" at Kenyon College and has delivered a lecture on "The Relevance of Virginia Woolf to the Women's Liberation Movement" for Gambier Experimental College. His teaching interests include Political Theory and Comparative Politics.

Delegates

Ron Alford	USAFA
Nyda Boerer	George Washington
Nancy Brumley	Idaho State
Lauren Casteel	Univ of Colorado, Denver
Michelle Colella	USC
Mike Golden	USNA
Melissa Hield	Univ of Texas
Linda Marmorstein	Chicago
Mary Ann McAnulty	USMMA
Jeanne Naegek	Miami
Carol Northrup	Colorado State
Jean Palmquist	Stephens
Leo Paulo	USMA
Mike Sackley	USAFA
Lynn Scott	USAFA

ROUND TABLE F

Ms. Connie Shaw
Communications/Management Specialist

As a consultant in communications and management skills, Ms. Shaw has had extensive experience teaching and presenting workshops in transactional analysis, organizational communication, effectiveness training, interpersonal communication, and non-verbal communication.

Ms. Shaw is a graduate of Madison College in Harrisonburg, Virginia, and is pursuing graduate studies at the University of Northern Colorado in the fields of communications and psychology. Since 1972, she has been engaged by numerous educational institutions, governmental agencies, and businesses in the Rocky Mountain area to present workshops and seminars for their staff members. These groups include the University of Colorado Medical Center, Porter Hospital, the Human Values Institute, and public schools throughout Colorado; the US Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Health, Education and Welfare, the Civil Service Commission, the National Park Service, and the Colorado Department of Personnel; the Martin Marietta Corporation and Mountain Bell Telephone Company.

Delegates

Susan Arnold	Colorado Women's College
John Burdon	USMA
Janet Elliot	Arizona
Victor Evans	USAFA
Fritz Frasier	USAFA
Fran Furchgott	North Carolina
Jill Ann Griffith	Ohio State
Byron Hepburn	USAFA
Connie Madden	Notre Dame
Diane McGaha	Colorado College
Lauretta Quintana	Fort Lewis
Susan Schubert	Univ of Colorado, Colo Spgs
Mike Schwartz	Tulane
Scott Turner	Texas A&M
Erika Wodinsky	Pomona

FINAL REPORT

EIGHTEENTH AIR FORCE ACADEMY ASSEMBLY

March 10 – 14, 1976

At the close of their discussion, the delegates to the Eighteenth Air Force Academy Assembly reviewed as a group the following statements. Although there was general agreement on the Final Report, it should by no means be assumed that every participant subscribes to every statement.

> The opinions, interpretations, and conclusions in the Final Report of the Eighteenth Air Force Academy Assembly are those of a majority of 90 students from 61 colleges and universities who attended. The contents of this report are in no way to be construed, directly or indirectly, as indorsed or approved by the US Air Force Academy, the US Air Force, or the Department of Defense.

Edited by

Mrs. Kay Woestendiek

Modified and Approved by the Assembly Delegates

EIGHTEENTH AIR FORCE ACADEMY ASSEMBLY

FINAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION – THE MOVE: FROM HOME WORK TO MARKET WORK

The major factors responsible for the continued increase in *women's labor force activity* during the last half-century could be divided into economic, social and personal conditions.

The need for additional household income, arising out of the state of the national economy, has encouraged increasing numbers of women to enter the work force. Women's desires to improve their standard of living and assert their independence have been encouraged by technological developments in health care, media communications, household conveniences, and transportation.

The technological advances, coupled with education, have influenced an increase in the number of socially acceptable life styles, and created an awareness of women's rights that, in turn, has manifested itself in enlightened legislation and growth of the contemporary women's movement. Finally, historical crises have had an impact on the labor market by moving women out of traditional roles and into non-traditional work areas.

Personal factors tend to overlap social and economic ones to change the awareness of traditional sex roles. The desire of women for career fulfillment will prompt even greater committment to the labor market in the future, which, in turn, will heighten job competition because of the increased supply of talent available to the labor market.

Inaccurate perceptions and expectations – both by employers and female workers – are reflected in women's job status and pay. Employer discrimination is closely related to the lack of discernible change in public attitude concerning women's day-to-day work performance. Women should not, however, be stigmatized by these historical attitudes as they are based on an inaccurate perception of women's ability to maintain their competence relative to male employees and

employers.

While there have been no perceptible changes in societal *attitudes* concerning women in the market place, there is evidence of significant *behavioral* change. Family structure and negative attitudes will become altered through pressures stemming from these behavioral changes.

Vertical and occupational *labor force mobility* will be increased with de-stereotyping of sex roles within the work force. At the same time, geographic mobility may be reduced due to the increased incidence of both the husband and the wife of a household pursuing careers, and thereby being dedicated to their respective professions (or jobs) and places of work. Changes of traditional work scheduling will be necessitated by the restructuring of the workforce.

SECOND SESSION – THE IMPACT: GAINS, LOSSES AND TRADEOFFS

The *criteria for evaluating losses and gains* resulting from change in the type of work done by women must be separated into familial and societal concerns.

Family considerations include the actual cost of working outside the home as opposed to the income earned. Another element is the psychological/sociological impact on the family and the woman herself. Society evaluates gains and losses by the more tangible criteria of productivity, employment levels, efficiency and stability. The final decision between market and non-market participation is one made by the individual woman within the context of personal, family and social needs.

The Assembly advocates an active *social policy* that would make it possible for mothers and fathers to create a self-sustaining household by freeing both of them from domestic duties, thus enabling each to obtain a full-time job if so desired. Recommendations to this end might include reform of tax regulations to reflect social conditions and attitudes, and a realistic policy regulating the welfare system based on total family income and the age of the children.

It is imperative that employers increase *the flexibility of work schedules* and part-time job opportunities for the

mutual benefit of business and individual workers. We recognize that the availability of more part-time jobs may not improve or change the quality of life, and could, in the short-run, even lead to inequities and inefficiencies of employment.

Women establishing a career of their own outside the home often challenge the "empty shell" marriages. Independence resulting from such a career may, indeed, affect the individual's *attitudes toward marriage and divorce*. Paramount in approaching the issue is consideration of the increased availability of contraceptives and abortions. These allow greater freedom for women to control their childbearing function and regulate their life/work activities. It is obvious that a family now can choose to limit its growth or prevent its formation completely, in favor of total devotion to individual careers. The options are open for each woman to take advantage of as she chooses.

Women's work outside the home does not necessarily cause marriage breakdowns, although, women now have the opportunity through participation in the labor market to leave or dissolve the marriage and still survive financially.

Working husbands and wives who are happy in their careers either in the home or the market place have a positive effect on the *quality of homelife*. We recognize the priority of quality over quantity in child care and family relationships. Thus, if both parents are involved in the labor market, all members of the family must make extra efforts to insure family-life cohesion.

THIRD SESSION – SOME IMPLICATIONS: ASPIRATIONS, EQUALITY, AND MARKET BEHAVIOR

The *goals, procedures and performance of the professions* inevitably will be influenced by the influx of women into the traditional institutions of law, medicine, ministry and academic administration. Because of the additional viewpoints and experiences brought to these fields, a natural improvement will evolve.

Requisites for sex equality in the work force include equal opportunity for training, published schedules, and equal

consideration based on ability. Equal pay for equal work, or work of equal value will, to a limited extent, correct workforce sex inequality. Some of the solutions lie, in part, in improving school curricula, developing leadership capacity through team athletics, opening scholarships and financial aid programs to more applicants, improving employer-employee attitudes in society, and enforcing equal opportunity legislation.

The *effect* of the increase in the proportion of women who work, *on the distribution of income* among high, middle, and low income groups is dependent upon any future changes in the size of the labor force and on other fluctuations in the economy.

Several suggestions regarding tax mechanisms also were presented, including the opinion that the Assembly lacked expertise to deal with the tax structure. Other suggestions include alternatives to using the tax mechanism to reduce income differentials; the development of a new progressive tax structure, allowing the option to file tax returns on a marginal tax system based on individual earnings and not on the combined total of a couple; and the adoption of a negative income tax to aid those below the poverty level, readjusted to the current level of the aggregate household income rate at the time the proposal is adopted. The present public policy of utilizing the tax mechanism to decrease income differentials should be continued, but inequities should be eliminated.

The Assembly noted that the tradition of not pricing home services has allowed society to perceive the monetary value of these services as minimal. More evenly shared market work necessitates decisions governing the allocation of household tasks. Reallocation will not only change relationships within the family, but may also establish a greater value on home work that, in turn, may require *the assignment of a dollar value* to the work for purposes both symbolic and economic. The Assembly agrees that fringe benefits for persons doing the home work are necessary. Social Security could be reformed and adapted to the new market/home work situations. Benefit programs could be worked out with individual and inter-personal relations being considered

(including workers' compensation, medical benefits and unemployment insurance).

FOURTH SESSION – THE FUTURE: ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE AND ECONOMIC POLICY

Actions needed to reduce *sex differentials in earning* include restructuring the language of job applications to avoid sex bias, marital status, and physical characteristics; enforcing legislation against sex discrimination in job opportunities; increasing access to education in order to reduce sex differentials; providing mechanisms for employees to satisfy grievances. It is believed that the government will play a prominent role in overseeing the actions of industry in job hiring. Corporate accountability is needed and should be worked into enforceable legislation.

All *reverse discrimination evaluations* should be based on the competence, ability, experience, and general work qualifications of the individual. Disadvantaged persons should be encouraged to participate in self-improvement and enrichment programs to aid them in acquiring standard requirements of education and employment. Affirmative action and seniority are equally important employment practices. In lay-off policies, however, both must be considered.

Regarding the issue of *day care for children of working parents*, the Assembly is of the opinion that multiple alternatives should be explored. Parents might use flex-time to care for their own children, which would increase fathers' responsibilities. The public school system and other existing institutions, such as youth organizations, could extend their services to include child care. Other possible solutions include government subsidized child care awarded on the basis of need, with priorities established for single parents and with a sliding scale on the basis of ability to pay, and use transfer of payments to allow parents their choice of a child care center to preclude governmental control as to the kind of care the child would receive.

With regard to *educational policy and emphasis*, sex segregation and bias fields of study should be abolished.

Equal funding providing for equal opportunity in future employment of both sexes include the following recommendations:

- Career awareness programs in primary education; available vocational training at the high school level, and continuing education for adults – especially in the initiation of reentry programs where they do not exist.
- Equally funded sports activity programs for both sexes.
- Encourage the continuation of the role of homemaker as a viable career, and at the same time reflect new attitudes toward homemaking.
- Personnel policies should creatively and actively seek to establish a qualified pool of applicants who would not otherwise be aware of career opportunities.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

A growing awareness of the changing roles of women and men in American society will have an impact on the socio-economic climate of the United States. Recognizing the significant role of women in creating and sustaining our society, and noting the economic and social injustices women have endured throughout our history, this Assembly thus endorses the Twenty-seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, known popularly as Equal Rights Amendment.

We endorse this amendment as a statement of principle, and an affirmation of the belief of the people of the United States that economic and social justice are independent of sex.

We recognize that his amendment will not solve immediately the issues we have discussed here.

We urge the legislatures of those states now considering the ERA to ratify it in this Bicentennial Year as symbolic of the concepts and ideas of 200 years ago that eventually were embodied in our Constitution.

EIGHTEENTH AIR FORCE ACADEMY ASSEMBLY

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES REPRESENTED

Baylor University
Brigham Young University
California Institute of Technology
The Citadel
Colorado College
Colorado State University
Colorado Women's College
Fort Hays State College
Fort Lewis State College
George Washington University
Harvard University
Idaho State University
Kansas State College
Kenyon College
Loretto Heights College
Miami University of Ohio
Montana State University
Northwestern University
Occidental College
Ohio State University
Oregon State University
Pomona College
Princeton University
Regis College
Rice University
San Francisco
St Mary's of Texas
Southern Colorado State
Stephens College
Texas A&M
Tulane University
University of Arizona
University of California at Berkeley
University of California at Los Angeles
University of Chicago
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Colorado at Denver
University of Denver
University of Houston
University of Indiana
University of Kansas
University of Nebraska
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
University of Northern Colorado
University of Notre Dame
University of Pittsburgh
University of the South
University of Southern California
University of Texas
University of Utah
University of Wyoming
US Air Force Academy
US Coast Guard Academy
US Military Academy
US Naval Academy
Vassar College
Virginia Military Institute
Western State College

72

OFFICER STAFF

Director
Captain Robert P. Haffa, Jr.

Assistant Director, Secretariat
Captain Thomas G. Newell

Assistant Director, Final Report
Captain Chris Jefferies

Assistant Director, Housing, Messing and Facilities
Captain George C. Gibson

Assistant Director, Protocol
Major Adolphus Andrews

Assistant Director, Public Relations
Captain Lloyd V. Hackley

Assisstant Director, Transportation
Captain John W. Page

Assistant Director, Delegate Selection and Preparation
Major Leopoldo R. Vasquez, USA

Assistant Director, Special Projects
Captain James B. Dixon

Assistant Director, Finance
Captain Charles L. Fox

73

CADET STAFF

Co-Chairmen
- Cadet First Class Kurt Klingenberger
- Cadet First Class Andrew Pijor

Special Assistant to the Co-Chairmen
- Cadet First Class Michael C. Raitt
- Cadet Second Class Michael Crane

Delegate Selection and Preparation
- Cadet First Class Bernard Goldbach

Housing, Messing and Facilities
- Cadet First Class Terry Williams

Protocol
- Cadet First Class Michael Blythe

Public Relations
- Cadet First Class Rico Racosky

Secretariat
- Cadet First Class John Andrew

Special Projects
- Cadet First Class Tim Shaffer

Finance
- Cadet First Class Kenneth Thieneman

Transportation
- Cadet First Class Clyde Ayer

THE ACADEMY ASSEMBLY HISTORY

The United States Air Force Academy cosponsors its Assembly with the American Assembly of Columbia University. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower established the American Assembly in 1950, while he was President of Columbia. Both the American Assembly and the Air Force Academy Assembly seek "to provide information, stimulate discussion, and evoke independent conclusions in matters of vital public interest."

From April 1-4, 1959, the First Air Force Academy Assembly was held. Seventy-five delegates from 30 colleges and universities discussed the problem of "International Stability and Progress." Addresses were made to the delegates by Paul H. Nitze, President of the Foreign Service Education Foundation, and Dr. Henry M. Wriston, President of the American Assembly.

Among the conclusions reached by the delegates to the First Assembly were: (1) Military assistance programs to foreign countries are vital instruments of our foreign policy, (2) the cost of these programs is well justified by the savings coming from the gains to our defenses which these programs indirectly bring about, (3) freer trade and long-range wealth-producing economic development of foreign nations are desirable goals, and (4) technical assistance programs overseas should be continued and expanded.

"The Representation of the United States Abroad" was the topic of the Second Assembly, which in March 1960 was attended by 80 delegates from 34 institutions of higher learning. Principal speakers were General Lauris Norstad, USAF (Ret), former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, and Dr. Harlan Cleveland, Dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

The delegates concluded that: (1) Shortsighted American public opinion is reflected in our failure to develop long term policies and programs supported by adequate and well-planned appropriations, (2) neither programs nor personnel can be expected to improve without definition of national goals and recertification of short-term approaches to the lasting problems of our age, and (3) an increased national

effort is necessary to marshal the understanding, appreciation, and support for our position in the world community.

The Assembly continued to expand, and 104 delegates attended the Third Assembly on "National Goals: Challenges for the Sixties." Speakers in 1961 were Currin V. Shields, Professor of Government, University of Arizona; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Special Assistant to the President of the United States; and Dr. Arthur L. Miller, Pastor, Montview Boulevard Presbyterian Church of Denver.

The Third Assembly offered in conclusion: "We see no need to alter the basic purpose which has given meaning and direction to the life of this country since it was founded. The goals we enunciate are timeless only in the sense that they draw their inspiration from that purpose in the contemporary situation. The goals are also, we would stress, national—we claim for them no universal validity. And yet we hope that the American national purpose is firmly rooted in the values which are universal, and that, therefore, both our national purpose and our goals show a decent respect for the vital interests of other nations."

"Arms Control" was the topic of the Fourth Assembly. Fifty-nine colleges and universities sent 103 students to participate. Key addresses were delivered by Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Director, Arms Control Project, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Governor Harold E. Stassen, Former Special Assistant to the President on Disarmament; and Ernest W. Lefever, Foreign Policy Analyst, Institute for Defense Analyses.

The topic of the Fifth Assembly was "The Secretary of State" and the Sixth Assembly in 1964, looked at "Outer Space." "The Congress and the American Future" was the topic of the Seventh Assembly which brought together 102 delegates from 63 colleges and universities. The principle speakers were Senator Mike Monroney of Oklahoma; Congressman F. Edward Herbert from Louisiana; and Dr. Richard E. Neustadt, Special Consultant to the President. The delegates concluded in part that: (1) Direct election of committee chairmen would promote more efficient operation in Congress than the present seniority rule, (2) members of Congress should be urged to disclose their financial holdings

to avoid conflicts of interest, and (3) "although there are dangers involved in the strengthening of the permanent bureaucracy as a result of legislative-executive conflict, they are controllable to the extent that Congress is willing to use it intelligently and not merely for carping its own capabilities for oversight."

The Eighth Assembly studied "Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations." Concerned mainly with the problem of adequate communication among nations, the Eighth Assembly heard from such people as Dr. Ben M. Cherrington, Director, Rocky Mountain Office of International Education; Senator Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut; and R. Sargent Shriver, formerly Director of the Peace Corps. This Assembly drew 120 delegates from 67 colleges and universities around the nation. The discussions centered on the following topics: communication with Communist states and with developing nations; the current emphasis of our cultural activities on the one hand and information and propaganda activities on the other; and government implementation and the work of private organizations. The Eighth Assembly ended on the hopeful note that the future will see increased communication among men and governments.

"A World of Nuclear Powers?" was the problem tackled by the Ninth Assembly which attracted 110 delegates from 64 schools across the country. The Assembly heard from such people as Dr. Donald G. Brennan of Hudson Institute and Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., Assistant Director, Science and Technology Bureau, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. After discussions on the prospects of nuclear proliferation the Assembly concluded: (1) Proliferation is a long process and the prices of proliferation and nonproliferation are unclear, (2) responsible nuclear management is a necessity for future, and (3) as yet, arms control is a problem for each nation to solve on its own. It is hoped that a search for security will not result in an unstable polycentric world situation.

"The United States and Eastern Europe" was the topic for the Tenth Assembly, its occurrence coming at a time when the events of Eastern Europe were continually before the eyes of the world. Principle speakers were Dr. Raymond E. Lisle

of the Department of State, Professor William E. Griffith from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Mr. Leonard Marks, then Director, United States Information Agency. Attending were 106 delegates from 70 colleges and universities throughout the United States. After developing the historical relationship between the United States and Eastern Europe, the delegates then discussed (1) the political and cultural parallels of the individual countries of Eastern Europe as well as the entire area, (2) the economic relationships of the area, and (3) the question of Germany and Central European security. The Assembly, in its final report, called for "independent East European states capable of genuine free choice in their distinctive domestic and foreign policies . . .' and added that "the challenge of East Europe's states is the challenge of reconciling . . . self-interest, national independence, and international stability."

The steadily growing problem of "Overcoming World Hunger" was the topic of the Eleventh Academy Assembly. Delegates were addressed by Professor Roger Revelle of Harvard University, Professor Philip M. Hauser from the University of Chicago, and Mr. Orville L. Freeman, President of EDP Technology International, Inc. In their final report delegates urged "more multilateral management of the problems surrounding world hunger" through such international organizations as the United Nations. The Assembly members concluded that "world hunger can perhaps be overcome, but the final answers rest in man's capacity for enlightened instincts."

The Twelfth Air Force Academy Assembly focused its attention on the topic "The States and the Urban Crisis." Delegates had the opportunity to hear and question the views of the Honorable Daniel J. Evans, Governor of Washington, Mr. Donald Rumsfeld, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, and Dr. Alan K. Campbell, Dean of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University. In their Final Report the delegates identified the urban crisis as a "real challenge to the American social, economic, and political system. . ." and stated that it should be given "the highest domestic priority." They also cautioned that "there can be no meaningful solutions to any of the

nation's urban problems without a new sense of understanding and concern on the part of all Americans."

The topic discussed by the Thirteenth Assembly was "The United States and the Caribbean." Over 100 delegates representing 70 universities and colleges heard from such distinguished speakers as Ambassador Ben S. Stephansky, Director, The W. E. Upjohn Department Consultant, former Ambassador to Ecuador and Venezuela; The Honorable John C. Culver, Congressman from Iowa; William D. Broderick, Director, Office of Caribbean Affairs, Department of State; Paul Cunningham, NBC News; and Ambassador Jack Hood Vaughn, President, National Urban Coalition, former Ambassador to Panama and Columbia, former Peace Corps Director. At the close of their discussion, the delegates, in their Final Report, stated the view that "the United States must refrain from all attempts, whether direct or indirect, to impose any one model for Caribbean development." They also expressed the belief that the "key in the United States-Caribbean relationship is the treatment in the United States of racial and other minority groups." Also the delegates felt that the "United States should pursue a policy of dealing with all governments as they are, without making political or moralistic judgments of other countries' domestic policies."

Delegates to the 14th Academy Assembly addressed the changing nature of Japanese-US relations. The rather dramatic shift in US policy vis-a-vis East Asia coupled with the emergence of Japan as an economic superpower precipitated the need for a fundamental reassessment of the Japanese-US relationship. The delegates discussed the future course of this relationship, the role of Japan in the Asian and world political environment, the possibilities of Japanese rearmament, and Japanese nuclear development. Expert commentary was provided by His Excellency Nobuhiko Ushiba (Ambassador of Japan to the United States), The Honorable Marshall Green (Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs), Mr. Hisahico

Okazaki (First Secretary of the Japanese Embassy to the US), Mr. Minoru Makihara (Mitsubishi International Corporation), Mr. Richard A. Ericson of the State Department, Professor Gregory Henderson, and Professor Robert Ward, Director of the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Michigan.

The Fifteenth Academy Assembly focused on the topic "The United States and The United Nations." Delegates discussed the effectiveness of the UN as a legitimate governing body in the international political arena and the United State's role as a chief actor and mediator within the security council. Senior participants included Professor Richard N. Gardner (Director of Freedom House), Michael J. Berlin (New York Post Correspondent to the UN), Ambassador William E. Schaufele, Jr. (Senior Advisor to the United States Permanent Representative to the UN), Dr. Edwin Ogbu (Ambassador of Nigeria to the UN), Senator Gale McGee, and F. Bradford Morse the Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs for the UN.

"Choosing the President" was the topic of the Sixteenth Assembly an issue which has been controversial since the founding of this nation but which became even more important as a result of the Watergate incident. Distinguished speakers included Professor Emmet John Hughes, Rutgers University; Barry M. Goldwater, Senator from Arizona; Mr. Gary Hart, Candidate for the US Senate; Professor Donald Matthews, University of Michigan; Professor Nelson W. Polsby, University of California; Mr. Geroge Reedy, Marquette University; and Representative Morris K. Udall, Representative from Arizona. In their final report the delegates expressed the opinion that the power of the executive branch had been over-extended on an unprecedented scale, but much of the responsibility for that increase in power could be traced to failure of other branches of government to fully accept their constitutional duties. There was a consensus that an effort should be made to develop criteria for the qualities a president should have. It was agreed that there should be attempts to increase the number of competitors for the presidential nomination, and the

Assembly supported the idea of having a ceiling on expenditures in political campaigns. Finally, the Assembly concluded that emphasis should be placed on revitalization of the educational process as a necessary element in producing citizens who would make the presidency a responsive instrument of the people rather than the aloof office it has become.

The Seventeenth Academy Assembly studied the problem of "Multinational Corporations: Agents of Conflict or Cooperation?" Eighty-six delegates from sixty-three colleges and universities were addressed by such speakers as Professor Richard N. Gardner, Columbia University; Mr. Ralph J. Massey, Johns-Manville Corporation; Mr. Minoru Makihara, Mitsubishi International Corporation; Professor Robert F. Meagher, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; and Mr. Herbert Salzman, Overseas Private Investment Corporation. In the Final Report, the delegates expressed the opinion that "Regulation of MNCs (Multi-National Corporations) is both necessary and desirable," but there were diverse opinions on how best to set up and enforce regulations. The belief was expressed that "MNCs will promote regional/international integration through greater use of common monetary systems, breakdowns of trade barriers, international market systems and channels for capital flow, and an exchange of socio-political ideas." The Assembly members concluded that "the MNC is an efficient, increasingly important force in the world situation . . . (and they) will continue to have resources and technology desired by the nation-states for their own economic betterment. There is—and will be—a degree of mutual interdependence. There seems to be no indication of an "inevitable conflict'."

Dr. Henry M. Wriston was president of the American Assembly for the first five Academy Assemblies. Dr. Clifford C. Nelson is the current president. Six Superintendents have headed the Assembly here since it started in 1959. They are Major Generals James E. Briggs, William S. Stone, and Robert H. Warren, Lieutenant General Thomas S. Moorman, Lieutenant General A. P. Clark, and Lieutenant General James R. Allen the present Superintendent.

USAFA, USAF ACADEMY, CO/76-1015

Proceedings Editor
Captain Robert P. Haffa, Jr.

82